



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 10, 2007

No. 77

## House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m.

The Reverend Ronald L. Calkins, Mary Queen of Peace Catholic Church, Mandeville, Louisiana, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, source of all wisdom, fill the Members of the House of Representatives with Your divine wisdom. They face many issues in serving the people of this Nation. May their decisions always be for the well-being of all our citizens.

Loving God, people of goodwill will have disagreements. May these not be a source of division but an opportunity to reflect more deeply on the issues that confront us.

May Your peace be in our hearts, our homes, our communities, our Nation, and our world. Protect those who serve to protect us, both here and abroad.

We pray to You, who are Lord and God, forever and ever. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JINDAL) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. JINDAL led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### WELCOMING THE REVEREND RONALD L. CALKINS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr.

JINDAL) is recognized for 1 minute as the sponsor of our Guest Chaplain today.

There was no objection.

Mr. JINDAL. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I'm delighted to have Father Ronald Calkins here today to offer our opening prayer.

Father Calkins, a constituent from my district, is the pastor of Mary Queen of Peace Catholic Church in Mandeville, Louisiana. Appointed in July 1995, Father Calkins has led Mary Queen of Peace through a period of rapid growth and overseen the opening of Mary Queen of Peace Catholic School, which turned 10 years old this past August.

We are honored to have Father Calkins with us here today. He has shown remarkable leadership, especially as his parish and as our State has struggled through and is recovering from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. I thank him for his dedication, his service to his parish, and to the residents of southeast Louisiana.

We welcome Father Calkins as well as the students and their chaperones from Mary Queen of Peace Catholic Church and School.

### RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, May 3, 2007, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair to receive the former Members of Congress.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 6 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

### RECEPTION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The Speaker of the House presided.

The SPEAKER. On behalf of the House, I consider it a high honor and a distinct personal privilege to have the

opportunity to welcome so many of our former Members and colleagues as may be present here for this occasion. We all pause to welcome you. I am particularly pleased that we have the former Speaker of the House, Tom Foley, with us today.

As we all know, Speaker Foley is a principled leader and a true statesman who presided over the House in a spirit of bipartisanship. Welcome. We are honored by your presence, Mr. Speaker.

I want to acknowledge the leadership of Congressman Jim Slattery, the President, and Congressman Jay Rhodes, the Vice President, and your leadership of the Former Members Association. You have shown the service to our country. We know it didn't begin when you first set foot on the floor but want to acknowledge that it certainly did not end when you left the Congress. Thank you all for your many years of public service and great leadership in the Congress.

As I look around, I wish to acknowledge also the distinguished former minority leader of the House, Bob Michel. What an honor for us to have you here, Bob. It's wonderful to see you. As we all know, he is a dedicated public servant, as have you all been and are. All of your hard work, the legislation you created, the lives you impacted, your legacy is still reflected in the halls of this magnificent Capitol, and not only that, more importantly, in communities around the country. Many of you were friends and mentors to those of us who are here now and we acknowledge that. We learned so much from all of you.

I am pleased to also acknowledge that in welcoming you, I am joined by our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER). He and I know, as do our colleagues, that the knowledge, experience and wisdom you shared in your time here has helped guide our work. I have said to the Members on many occasions,

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4755

when we come here, we are not only colleagues to each other, we are colleagues to everyone who ever served here before, because this, the People's House, is a place where the continuity of ideas and commitment and patriotism to our country has a oneness to it. In that spirit, I feel a colleague to my own father who served in the Congress of the United States.

Do we have a Senator here, as well? Senator SPECTER, welcome. Thank you for being here.

Thank you all for your work and your leadership on behalf of the American people. On behalf of the current Members again, thank you for your leadership. Please enjoy your day back in the People's House.

I now have the privilege of turning the gavel over to a Republican, a wonderful, wonderful leader in the Congress when he served here, respected on both sides of the aisle. He, too, a principled leader who served with a spirit of bipartisanship and patriotism in the Congress. I am pleased to acknowledge the Vice President of the Association and hand the gavel to Mr. Rhodes to take the chair. The Honorable Jay Rhodes.

Mr. RHODES (presiding). Thank you so much for lending us the Chamber of the People's House. We appreciate it very much.

It occurred to me last night that Ms. PELOSI and I were elected in the same year, 1986, the 100th Congress, and that Congress has produced two Speakers of the House, Mr. HASTERT and Ms. PELOSI. Now, I don't know if that's historical or not, but it's at least interesting. Thank you so much.

The regular order of business would be for me now to ask the Clerk to call the roll, but I believe that in the interest of recognizing Mr. HOYER's time limitations, I would ask that the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Maryland, utilize such time as he may consume.

Mr. HOYER. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

He says he yields me so much time as I may consume. One of the great benefits of being majority leader, or minority leader, for that matter, although no one seeks the benefit of being minority leader, I understand that, but is that you are unlimited in time. You're yielded 1 minute and you take such time as you want. You become very arrogant in the use of verbiage at that point in time. But I am very, very pleased to be here with all of you. I try to make these events every time you come, because as Speaker PELOSI, and what an historic event you have just participated in. You are the first group of former Members in over 200 years of our Republic that has been greeted by a woman Speaker. The President was so gracious the first time that NANCY and I went down and had lunch with the Speaker. It was just 2 days after the election. President Bush could not have been more gracious and more generous in his comments about the his-

torical aspect and his congratulations for NANCY's accomplishment. It is an extraordinary accomplishment. As you have noticed, she is as strong and focused and competent a Speaker as I have served with. And I know there is a wonderful friend here, who I also want to greet, and that is my friend Tom Foley. When I came to the Congress of the United States, Tom was the whip. I had the great honor of being the whip at one point in time, as you know.

I am now in the office that Tom Foley peopled. He was ensconced in the first floor of the Capitol, we had many whip meetings there, and he taught me how to be a Member of Congress. And I could have had no better teacher than Tom Foley, no more principled, decent person than Tom Foley.

I will tell you this, and you have heard me say it before. I would not have chosen to be in the minority. And in 1994 with this hostile takeover as I refer to it of the institution of which I was a Member, I became a minority stockholder in, one of the sadnesses, I think, of the 1994 transfer of authority was not so much it was a transfer of authority, that's what happens in democracies, but that an extraordinary American did not become the Speaker of the House, somebody that I love and respect and honor who I think is one of the most decent people with whom I have served in 40 years in a legislative body and that is, of course, the very distinguished, wonderful American first as well as, of course, a distinguished Republican leader, my friend Bob Michel. Bob, thank you for what you have done.

When the American people think of what they would like to see in the Congress of the United States and the kind of collegiality and respect for one another and civility that they would like to see, they think of Bob Michel and Tom Foley in my opinion. They may not think of them by name, but they think of who they are and what they represent.

I am also pleased to see ARLEN SPECTER who was masquerading as a former Member sitting with the Speaker. As a matter of fact, RAY LAHOOD traveled with me overseas. We went to Darfur, we were in Sudan, and we were in Egypt. In Egypt, we had a cocktail party, a reception at the Ambassador's residence and I introduced RAY LAHOOD as the former staffer of the Speaker. Kathy, his wife, came up to me and said, "Bob Michel was never Speaker." I said, "I know, but in my mind he should have been."

Jack Kemp is here, also my friend. We had the opportunity to serve on the Appropriations Committee as well. Jack, of course, a distinguished Vice Presidential candidate, now who continues as so many of you do in your own public lives to be so involved in trying to make our country better. Jack, thank you for all you have done.

I could mention each and every one of you, but Speaker Rhodes would say

you're pressing on that 1 minute a little much. But let me say that those of you who are former Members, some, of course, are former Members by choice. Some, as you reflect upon a democracy that sometimes makes mistakes, are former Members by mistake of your constituencies. But in any event it occurs to me that all of you are financially far better off than us poor people you left behind, and I congratulate you for that.

I want to congratulate Mr. Slattery, who's our leader on the Democratic side, and Jay Rhodes. I saw Jay in the hallway just the other day. I had the opportunity of serving briefly with his dad and then with him and both reflect the decency of which I have spoken earlier.

Let me also say that I am now the majority leader, and thwarting the will of the majority is something that we criticize very severely and properly so. In a democracy, you do not want to thwart the will of the majority. But as majority leader, I want you to know that I work very hard at thwarting the will of the minority. Sometimes they get upset by it. I don't understand that, Bob, but it happens.

Let me thank all of you. Let me thank all of you for holding high the institutional values that the Founding Fathers and Americans want to establish, a body that brings together the various differences within our society, the various interest groups within our society, and tries to synthesize those differences into rational consensus for progress for our country. If we continue to do that, we will continue to merit the respect of our fellow citizens. If we do not, then they will properly have us all become former Members.

God bless what you have done, are doing and continue to do on behalf of our country and on behalf of the House of Representatives. Thank you very much.

Mr. RHODES. Thank you, Mr. Leader. One of the worst kept secrets in the House of Representatives is that Mr. HOYER is one of my two Congressmen. He doesn't know that yet. I will write him about the pothole fairly soon.

Thank you, Mr. HOYER. I appreciate it very much.

And now if the Clerk will call the roll of the former Members of Congress.

The Clerk called the roll of the former Members of Congress, and the following former Members answered to their names:

FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS PARTICIPATING  
IN 37TH ANNUAL SPRING MEETING THURSDAY,  
MAY 10, 2007

Mr. Bowen of Mississippi  
Mr. Browder of Alabama  
Mr. Buechner of Missouri  
Mrs. Byron of Maryland  
Mr. Coyne of Pennsylvania  
Mr. DioGuardi of New York  
Mr. Foley of Washington  
Mr. Forbes of New York  
Mr. Frey of Florida  
Mr. Frost of Texas  
Mr. Gilman of New York

Mr. Glickman of Kansas  
 Ms. Heckler of Massachusetts  
 Mr. Hertel of Michigan  
 Mr. Hockbrueckner of New York  
 Mr. Hughes of New Jersey  
 Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin  
 Mr. Kastenmeier of Wisconsin  
 Mr. Kemp of New York  
 Mr. Klein of New Jersey  
 Mr. Konnyu of California  
 Mr. Kramer of Colorado  
 Mr. Kyros of Maine  
 Mr. Lancaster of North Carolina  
 Mr. Lent of New York  
 Ms. Long of Louisiana  
 Mr. Mazzoli of Kentucky  
 Mr. Michel of Illinois  
 Mr. Moore of Alabama  
 Mr. Moore of Louisiana  
 Mr. Nichols of Kansas  
 Mr. Parker of Mississippi  
 Mr. Parris of Virginia  
 Mr. Pollock of Alaska  
 Mr. Rhodes of Arizona  
 Mr. Sarasin of Connecticut  
 Mr. Sarpalius of Texas  
 Mr. Slattery of Kansas  
 Mr. Smith of Oregon  
 Mr. Sundquist of Florida  
 Mr. Symms of Idaho

Mr. RHODES. The Chair announces that 41 former Members of Congress have responded to their names as being present.

At this point, it is my pleasure to introduce to you a very good friend and a distinguished colleague, the President of the Former Members, Mr. Slattery from Kansas.

Mr. SLATTERY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's a pleasure to see you all this morning and it's great to welcome you back to this institution that we love. First of all, let me say that it's a special privilege for us to be greeted by the Speaker so warmly.

Thank you, Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader HOYER, for those wonderful greeting remarks. I would like to just associate myself with STENY HOYER's remarks about all of the distinguished Members that are here this morning. I won't be redundant in recognizing all of you again except to say that it is particularly wonderful to see Minority Leader Bob Michel here, Jack Kemp, and former Speaker Foley, who all of these people inspired so many of us when we first came to this institution. We are particularly grateful to see you. It's great to see Secretary Glickman here, Secretary Henson Moore, and also Governor Sundquist here. It's great to welcome all of you back. Thank you very much for coming.

It is always an honor and a privilege to return to this magnificent institution which we revere and where we shared so many memorable experiences. Service in Congress is both a joy and a heavy responsibility. Whatever your party affiliation, we have great admiration for those who continue to serve their country in this unique institution. We thank them all for once again giving us the opportunity to re-

port on the activities of the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress. This is our 37th annual report to Congress, and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

Mr. RHODES. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. SLATTERY. Our association is nonpartisan. It was chartered by Congress but receives no funding from Congress. All the activities which we are about to describe are financed either from membership dues, program-specific grants and sponsors, or at our fund-raising dinner. We have a wide variety of domestic and international programs which several other Members and I will discuss briefly. Our membership numbers almost 600, and our purpose is to continue the service to country which for many began during our terms in the House of Representatives and the United States Senate.

I have had the privilege to serve as President of our association for almost 1 year and I would like to take this opportunity to thank my predecessor for passing this organization on to me in great condition. Jack Buechner was our President for 2 years and although great personal tragedy befell his family during his tenure, he steadfastly implemented a vision which I share and that is that the Former Members Association be known and respected for the substantive programs we undertake, be it in legislative strengthening work abroad or teaching American college students about the role of democracy in the United States.

We again have had a very successful, active and rewarding year. We have continued our work serving as a liaison between the current Congress and legislatures overseas. We have created partnerships with highly respected institutions in the area of democracy building and election monitoring. We have created new projects, most notably a webcasting program which reaches thousands of college students on a weekly basis. And we again sent dozens of bipartisan teams of former Members of Congress to university campuses here in the United States and abroad as part of our Congress to Campus Program. I am, therefore, very pleased to now report on the program work of the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress.

Less than 2 years ago, our association approached the Canadian Association of Former Members of Congress and the Association of Former Members of the European Parliament to create an entity that would train former legislators in democracy building work, most notably election monitoring. The resulting organization, the International Election Monitors Institute, has become the cornerstone of our democracy building work.

I now would like to ask one of the founders of this institute, Dennis Hertel of Michigan, to report on this aspect of our programming.

Mr. HERTEL. I thank the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. RHODES. The Chair recognizes Mr. Hertel for such time as he may consume, so long as it's not too much.

Mr. HERTEL. Thank you, Jim, for giving me the opportunity to report on the International Election Monitors Institute and other advances our association has made in this field. The institute has created a board of directors made up of former legislators from the United States, Canada and Europe. I am pleased to see so many of them with us here today from Canada and Europe. I especially want to thank Doug Rowland and his wife Helen for their great leadership in our efforts. We work together to train our former colleagues in accepted election observation conduct, particularly the Code of Conduct created by the United Nations, and we collaborate with several renowned organizations in this field to send our members on election monitoring missions across the globe. We have an invitation from OSCE to add our trained observers to their missions, primarily in eastern Europe. In addition, we are coordinating with the OAS to have former legislators play a role in their delegations. Thanks to the Canadian International Development Agency, we now have a 5-year grant to create a training course and other initial programs to get the institution off the ground, to begin this very month. We are extremely honored to be one of a few organizations that were invited to participate in an election monitoring convention in Strasbourg, France, earlier this year.

But the concept goes beyond election monitoring. We envision that our members can become permanently instrumental in democracy building work, such as training newly elected legislators, or aiding in a peaceful transition of government. We, therefore, are working closely with organizations such as NDI, IRI, IFES, and the U.S. Department of State so that the unique expertise we have can be used to maximum benefit. For example, last year we had the opportunity to bring our members together with elected officials from countries such as Kenya and Afghanistan. We were able to share our experience and aid those nations as they try to establish a democratic form of government. In addition to all of these projects, we are thrilled to continue our working relationship with the House Democracy Assistance Commission, so ably chaired by DAVID PRICE, Congressman from North Carolina. We will work with them as they bring visiting delegations to the United States, and we will have our members travel abroad to help implement their program in its overseas legislative strengthening missions.

I am very excited that our association has embarked on these types of missions and I believe that we are making a real difference in strengthening democracy worldwide. Please see our Web site at [www.usafmc.org](http://www.usafmc.org) for a

much more detailed description of these projects.

I really want to thank the members who have been so active in sacrificing their time, including those members who went to oversee the Ukraine election over the Christmas holidays, to show how they have stood up for democracy around the world and making the great sacrifice in their own personal lives. Thank you.

Mr. SLATTERY. Thank you, Dennis, for the report.

Mr. RHODES. Will the gentleman suspend for a moment.

The Republican leader, Mr. BOEHNER, is in the Chamber and out of deference to what I know is a busy schedule for him, I would like to recognize the Republican leader.

Mr. BOEHNER. Good morning to all of you and welcome back for the 37th annual Former Members Day. I look around the audience and see a lot of familiar faces. I just want to say thank you. Thank you for your service to the institution and thank you for what you are continuing to do.

I presume that some of you know, but of your colleagues, Bob Walker's, wife passed away several days ago. Our prayers are with Bob and his family. Bob and I served together. His wife was a great influence on him and on his career, and it's sad to see her go over a fight with cancer that had gone on since last summer.

I had to come today, one, to see all of you, but to see my good friend Bob Dole. Bob and I got to know each other in 1994, when I was this bomb-throwing new Member, relatively new Member—Sarpalius remembers—and then in 1995 after Republicans took the majority, Bob and I sat in many bicameral leadership meetings together. And for some young whippersnapper who didn't know the ways around here, not that I always agreed with Senator Dole, but I always had great respect for him. Especially now, looking back those 12, 13 years ago, I realize how much I learned from Bob. I think Bob represents all that we would expect of ourselves in his demeanor, the way he did his business here. He represents an entire generation of Americans, the World War II generation, and I couldn't miss this opportunity to come and say hello to him.

Now, all of you know that Bob would tend to sit on his porch and work on his tan. Then he would run off to Florida on the weekends and work on his tan. And one night when we could still fly airplanes, private airplanes out of National, I ran into Bob one day as we were going somewhere, he was coming back, and he looked over at me and says, "Hey, tan man." And so this has been a running joke between the two of us, because if there was somebody who always had a better tan than I did, it was Dole.

I could tell other stories, Bob, but I think I'll stop there. Let me just say welcome. Welcome back to all of you. Thank you for what you did for this in-

stitution to keep it alive and healthy for our generation. I just hope that those of us who have some guiding hand in where this institution is going today can do as good a job as all of you have in terms of leaving the institution in a stronger way for the next generation of leaders. Thank you and welcome.

Mr. RHODES. On behalf of the association, Mr. BOEHNER, thank you very much for your time and your thoughts and for the work you do for all of us.

Mr. Slattery.

Mr. SLATTERY. Thank you, Leader BOEHNER, for coming by and greeting us. We appreciate it. I also appreciate your service to our country and to this institution.

In addition to the international work that Dennis just highlighted, our association also focuses on creating a dialogue involving current Members of Congress and their colleagues in legislatures abroad. We administer four congressional study groups involving Germany, Turkey, Mexico and Japan. We have arranged almost 500 special events at the U.S. Capitol for international delegations from over 80 countries and the European Parliament. We hosted meetings for individual Members of Parliament and parliamentary staff, and organized approximately 50 foreign policy seminars in about a dozen countries involving more than 1,500 former and current legislators.

To report in more detail about the Congressional Study Groups, I yield the floor to the former President of the Association, Jack Buechner from Missouri.

Mr. BUECHNER. Thank you, Jim.

The association actually operates as the secretariat for four very special programs where we share legislative ideas with parliamentarians, our staff to their staffs, in Germany, which is the flagship of our program, and the longest standing one, Turkey, Japan and Mexico. The study group on Germany serves as a model for all the other study groups under the umbrella of the association and it has been in existence for 20 years. It has allowed communication of really an extraordinary status. The study group was founded in 1983 as an informal group and became formal in 1987. Ongoing study group activities include a Distinguished Visitors Program at the U.S. Capitol for guests from Germany; sponsoring annual seminars involving Members of Congress and the Bundestag; providing information about participants in the Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange Program; and organizing a senior congressional staff study tour to Germany. The 2007 annual Congress-Bundestag seminar took nine current Members of the House to Hamburg and Berlin for meetings with their peers in the Bundestag. In addition, we arranged a meeting for the group with German Chancellor Angela Merkel and were thrilled that she participated in a follow-up to that meeting here on Capitol Hill just last week. The Congress-

sional Study Group on Germany would like to thank Craig Kennedy of the German Marshall Fund, the primary supporter of activities related to the study group. Additional funding comes from a group of corporations who have been very supportive, including Luft-hansa, Daimler Benz, BASF, Deutsche Telekom and DHL Americas.

Emulating Germany and the other study groups, the association established a Congressional Study Group on Turkey at the beginning of 2005, one of our strategic allies and is at the crossroads of many challenges of the 21st century. Current Members of Congress have been brought together with their legislative peers in Turkey and serves as a platform for participants to learn about relations between our two countries. Thanks to funding from the Turkish Coalition of America, the Economic Policy Research Institute and other groups, including the German Marshall Fund, this is becoming a very, very special relationship. We also want to thank Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan who also came over and met with our members and the congressional Members.

The association serves as the secretariat for the Congressional Study Group on Japan and on Mexico. We have been lucky enough to have Foreign Minister Taro Aso as a visitor twice and then just recently Ambassador Chris Hill, head of the U.S. Delegation to the Six-Party Talks on the North Korea nuclear issue, spoke to a very special group of sitting Members of the Congress.

Last but not least we have got the study group on Mexico which has really been special in taking together senior staffers and exchanging them. I have had the pleasure of moderating a follow-up to this trip when our organization hosted a webcast focused on immigration, obviously an issue that is of great concern to both parties.

Let me also add that the association has had a highly productive working relationship with the French Ambassador, his Excellency Jean-David Levitte which has led to the creation of the Former Members Committee on France.

There are so many things that the association has done and we thank the Congress for allowing us to work with them and have them exchange with their counterparts throughout the world. We hope it will continue that way. I think that the Members can be very proud of the work they do to make these groups possible. I look forward to being an active participant in the activities of the study groups for years to come.

Thank you.

Mr. RHODES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Slattery.

Mr. SLATTERY. Jack, thanks again for the report.

We can be proud, I think, of the excellent programming offered by these study groups. Of course not all of our

activities are international in nature. One of the most gratifying programs involving our association's members is the Congress to Campus Program. This is a bipartisan effort to share with college students throughout the country our unique insight on the work of the Congress and the political process. We have collaborated on this program for many years with the Stennis Center for Public Service and we appreciate the invaluable assistance they render to make this program so successful.

Since 2003, this program was managed by our colleague David Skaggs in conjunction with the Council for Excellence in Government. David has returned to public service and is now executive director of Colorado's Department of Higher Education. But he did a tremendous job managing the Congress to Campus Program and under his leadership it expanded year after year. During this last academic year which just concluded, we visited 28 schools and interacted with approximately 13,000 students. We thank David for his efforts.

To further report on this program is Mike Parker of Mississippi. Mike, it is good to see you and look forward to a brief report here on the Congress to Campus Program.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time I would like to just submit my report for the record, we're running a little short of time today, but encourage everyone to get involved in the Congress to Campus Program. It is an extremely effective program for our organization.

Thank you, Jim, for the opportunity to report on this outstanding program. The Congress to Campus Program addresses a significant shortfall in civic learning and engagement among the country's young people of college age. It combines traditional educational content about American government and politics (especially Congress) with a strong message about public service, all delivered by men and women who have "walked the walk." The Program sends bipartisan pairs of former Members of Congress to visit college, university and community college campuses around the country. During each visit, the Members conduct classes, hold community forums, meet informally with students and faculty, visit high schools and civic organizations, and do interviews and talk show appearances with local press and media.

This year, Congress to Campus has expanded to include former Member participation in Washington, DC area meetings with student groups wishing to learn about public service, the U.S. Congress and Federal Government, and important political and policy issues. All told, this academic year former Members spoke to more than 13,000 college and high schools students under the auspices of the Congress to Campus Program. We have to thank the Council for Excellence in Government and the Stennis Center for Public Service without whom this great program could not have been conducted this year.

In the 2006–2007 academic year, the program sponsored twenty-four events involving twenty-eight colleges and universities around the country and the world. These visits took

thirty former Members to universities, service academies, and colleges in fourteen states and three countries. Eleven former Members made more than one campus visit.

We continue to fine-tune the content and substance of program visits based on feedback from Members and host professors. The program asks visiting Members and host professors to complete an evaluation of each visit. We encourage host schools to include nearby colleges and universities in Congress to Campus visits and to schedule a broad scope of classes and activities for the former Members. We will continue to make changes in response to the suggestions of participating former Members and host faculty.

A draft schedule of events is prepared in advance of each campus visit and reviewed by staff to assure variety as well as substance. There is a conference call before each trip with Members and the responsible campus contact person to review the revised schedule and iron out any remaining problems. Members also receive CRS briefing materials on current issues and background information on government service opportunities prior to each visit.

This year the Congress to Campus Program greatly expanded its working relationship with the People to People Ambassador Program (PTP). PTP brings groups of Junior High students from around the country to the Washington, DC area to participate in "World Leadership Forum" events. Students are nominated by teachers to attend and are selected based on their academic achievement, interest in government and international affairs, and leadership potential. This academic year former Members participated in twenty-seven PTP events by speaking to students about public service and character in political and legislative leadership.

The Congress to Campus Program's association with PTP furthers the Program's goals of promoting public service and understanding of the U.S. Congress and federal government. Several former Members were more than generous with their time and efforts as they participated in several of these early-morning PTP events. Those participating in PTP events this year were Bob Carr (MI), Bill Clinger (PA), Orval Hansen (ID), Matt McHugh (NY), Bruce Morrison (CT), Ron Sarasin (CT), and David Skaggs (CO). I also participated in some of these meetings and can highly recommend the experience to my colleagues. It is just great to interact with these kids!

Congress to Campus made its first international visit in October 2003 to the United Kingdom. Since that time campus visits have taken former Members to universities in Canada, China, Germany, and back to the United Kingdom. This year former Members made four visits outside of the U.S. which included stops at eight universities in Canada and the United Kingdom.

The success of the Program obviously depends on Members' participation. With travel back and forth, Members end up devoting about three days to each campus visit. This is a priceless contribution of an extremely valuable resource. This year Members of the Association will again be surveyed to solicit information regarding their availability for and interest in a program campus visit. We will use responses to these surveys and personal contact with the membership to update the roster of those available to make campus visits. As-

sociation Members are encouraged to complete and return the survey they will receive this summer and then to be ready to accept assignments to one of the fine institutions of higher education the Program will serve next year.

Interest in Congress to Campus remains strong in the academic community. Association Members participating in campus visits are enthusiastic about the value of the Program and the rewards it brings to all who are involved in those visits. The Program could be expanded even further on domestic levels if funding uncertainties can be addressed and Member participation is broadened. Thank you.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mike, thanks so much. Again, we thank David Skaggs for his leadership on this. We are running short on time here today, so we will move along quickly.

There are numerous other activities of the Association of Former Members which deserve to be highlighted today, but in the interest of time we are going to be very brief in this.

I would like to yield to my friend and colleague Lou Frey of Florida who conceived this idea of a webcasting program. Lou, if you could give us a brief report on the webcasting project which I think holds great potential in terms of our ability to communicate especially with college students all across the country and we are already reaching thousands with this webcasting program, thanks to your initiative.

Mr. FREY. Thank you, Mr. President.

I have an institute at the University of Central Florida and we have about 500 to 1,000 kids come every 6 months. It was rather frustrating because lot of young people couldn't get there. We said maybe we can put this on the Internet and somebody will look at it. We started doing that and next thing you know, we had about 60,000 or 70,000 young people over the Internet looking at it.

So I went to Jim and I said, Jim, there is no better place for programming than the former Members of Congress. There's more intelligence here, there's more knowledge, and it's really needed across the country. And why don't we see if we can take this idea and use it for the former Members.

So we started that process. We have had, oh, five, six or seven Internet programs already. We have reached about 60,000 people. We just signed an agreement with an Internet radio station that has up to 13 million subscribers, and we were very pleased to see Staples has agreed to come on as our chief sponsor. So now we've got a base of maybe 60 colleges, a school district in California, a number of high schools, and I think by the time we get to this place next year, we seriously should have somewhere between a half a million people and a million people on our Internet system. It really will get the former Members out across the country and it is something that's really needed.

I want to mention, too, that Brook Smith, who is the head of it, the network, itself, has been a great help, Jim, in working with us. I will submit my remarks for the RECORD.

Thank you, Jim. You are absolutely right, in addition to the election monitor venture Dennis Hertel described earlier, the webcasting project is certainly the most exciting new development for our Association in many years. I became involved in creating programming for the Internet via the Lou Frey Institute of Politics and Government at the University of Central Florida. We have a symposium every six months and it always seemed to me that the panels and expert discussions we hosted ought to reach an audience greater than the five hundred to a thousand people we could fit into an auditorium. So about 2 years ago we put one of our events on the internet and hooked up a couple of universities to participate. The response was tremendous and it very quickly became obvious that we had discovered a real need for substantive and issue-specific programming to go out to a community of universities and high schools. Picture a three-hour program focused on the environment. It goes out to numerous schools via the Internet and students from all over the country can view it and, more importantly, engage in a live dialogue by asking questions and e-mailing comments to the panelists.

The obvious next step was to expand the list of content providers while also expanding the list of viewers. Given all the important and fascinating work our Association does, I immediately thought of the former Members as a regular webcast producer. Our Association staff, particularly Pete Weichlein and Rebecca Zylberman, have put tremendous effort and imagination into this idea and they have really run with it. We've worked together for many months on the webcasting project and we have created some very impressive programming and discussions. This in turn has driven university subscribers and we now have over 60 institutions of higher learning, along with over 20 high schools and an entire California school district, subscribing to the program. That's a potential audience of over 500,000 students! We also have an agreement with an internet radio station that reaches 13 million subscribers. And the list keeps on growing. The first webcast of the Association was in early November of last year. Our staff put together three separate panels consisting of almost 20 of our Association members to analyze every aspect of the mid-term elections. The webcast lasted three hours and was viewed by over 60,000 students. We have since then put together a slew of very impressive and informative programming, focusing for example on President Bush's State of the Union Address or on the immigration debate in the Congress. Just yesterday we hosted a one hour webcast involving our Canadian and European colleagues to discuss the importance of election monitoring and the mechanics of observing both a campaign and an election. This program is a great way of reaching out to thousands of college and high school students. It gives them the chance to have a real discussion with our members about topics they read about in the newspapers or hear about on TV. And it gives our members the chance to interact with the next generation of America's leaders. Given the great work we do with the Congress to Campus Program, the

webcasting project is a natural extension of that effort.

To make the webcasting project a permanent addition to our programming, we had to find some partners who could support this endeavor. We are working with the Educational Webcasting Network (EWN) and its President Brook Smith and they provide to us the technological know-how to present a professional broadcast to our students. Also, via the EWN, we have found a corporate sponsor to make the program a reality. I am very pleased to announce today that Staples will support our webcasting project and give it the necessary backing to continue this active and exciting endeavor. We are thrilled about this new partnership and I would like to thank Staples for the trust they have placed in us.

Virtually everyone of our Association's many programs lends itself to being discussed via a webcast. For example, I am working right now on completing a follow-up to the Association's very successful publication: *Inside the House, Former Members Reveal How Congress Really Works*. This second volume will compile the rules of the road of politics and life former and current Members of Congress have sent to me over the past 2 years. For instance, less than a year before he passed away, President Ford sent me a five-page summary of his rules. What were your basic rules of thumb, both in politics and in life? How did they play out once you got to Capitol Hill? We have received a tremendous number of responses to our last call for submissions, but it is not too late to send me your rules of the road, just do it as soon as possible. You can contact our Association office and they'll let you know how to get it to me. We are hoping to finish the book later this year and will have a book presentation via our webcast once the 2nd volume is published.

Our Association has taken great strides toward becoming a well-known and highly respected think tank nationally and internationally for a wide range of tremendously important issues. We all have such a unique skillset and experience, and I am thrilled to see that via the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress there is a vehicle to share that expertise with the public, particularly students, both here in the United States and abroad. Thank you.

Mr. SLATTERY. Thank you, Lou.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of time, I will insert the rest of our report in the RECORD.

#### DINNER, NEW ORLEANS

Thank you, Lou, for that report and thank you also for pioneering this webcasting opportunity for our Association. I agree with you that this is a very exciting development with tremendous potential for our organization and its members. Our Association also owes Lou Frey a debt of gratitude for his 10th year as chairman of our Annual Statesmanship Award Dinner. This is the Association's only fundraising event and without Lou Frey we would not have had 10 years of financial growth for our organization. He is tireless, some say merciless, in whipping our dinner committee into shape and working until the very last minute to make the evening a success. The 10th annual dinner was held in March and we were very pleased that we could honor not one, but two of our former colleagues. We bestowed upon former Member Dirk Kempthorne of Idaho—as you well know he currently serves as Sec-

retary of the Interior—our Distinguished Service Award. And, we took the occasion of this being our 10th dinner, to create a new award: the Excellence in Public Service Award. We recognized former Member Rob Portman of Ohio for his tremendous work since leaving Congress, most recently as the Director of OMB. Mr. Speaker, allow me to just briefly highlight some of the other activities of our Association during 2006. For example, in October of last year the Association hosted a Fall Meeting in New Orleans. The purpose of the Fall Meeting is to bring our membership together in a place other than Washington, DC. A little more than one year has passed since the devastation of Hurricane Katrina, and we wanted to give our members the opportunity to see for themselves how far the rebuilding effort had come along and how much work still needs to be done. At this point we should thank Senator MARY LANDRIEU and her fantastic staff for helping us put together a very intense and impressive program. Our members met with city officials, including the Superintendent of Police, as well as the Army Corps of Engineers. We toured the lower 9th Ward and the 17th Street Canal Breach. It is an understatement to say that our group was unprepared for the devastation still rampant in that beautiful city. Even today, there are whole neighborhoods that remain uninhabitable. But we should also highlight that the reconstruction efforts the city and its people have undertaken are amazing and inspiring. New Orleans is one of the jewels of this country and we need to be mindful that the city deserves all the help we can give it.

#### OFFICERS AND BOARD

Mr. Speaker, the Association benefits tremendously from the efforts and leadership of many people. I wish to thank my fellow officers of the Association for their energy, dedication and invaluable counsel during my first year as President. They are Jay Rhodes, Dennis Hertel, Mike Parker, and Jack Buechner. Let me also thank the members of our Board of Directors and our Counselors for providing excellent guidance and support throughout the year. In addition, we benefit greatly from the wonderful work of Auxiliary, led so ably by Debi Alexander.

Mr. Speaker, to administer all these programs takes a staff of dedicated and enthusiastic professionals. We expanded our team from four to five full-time employees since our last report, which is another sign of how active and successful a year it has been for the Association.

#### VISITING FOREIGN FORMER MEMBERS

Mr. Speaker, we already reported on the work of the International Election Monitors Institute which we created in conjunction with our colleagues from Canada and from the European Union. We are very pleased to have with us today several former legislators as our guests. The Canadian Association of Former Parliamentarians is represented by its Chair, Doug Rowland, as well as former Members Don Boudria and Doug Frith. Mr. John Parker is with us representing the Ontario Association of Former Parliamentarians. From the Association of Former Members of the European Parliament we welcome Anna Pietrasik and Richard Balfe. And from the New Zealand Parliament we are joined by Maurice McTigue. We are honored that you are here and thank you for the great relationship our organizations enjoy.



Mr. RHODES. I would like to just add what I know you would like to add in terms of thanks to Lou Frey for his service to this association.

Mr. SLATTERY. Absolutely.

Mr. RHODES. He does a lot of work for us and it always turns out well. It always adds to his ulcers, but in the end everything comes out just fine, Lou. We appreciate you very, very much. Thank you.

Mr. SLATTERY. Amen, Lou. Appreciate you and appreciate all you do and have done for the association.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just take 1 minute to acknowledge the incredible staff that we have over at the Association: Pete Weichlein, our executive director, who's doing an incredible job; Sudha David-Wilp who manages our international programs is just wonderful; Rebecca Zylberman, the senior program officer; Meredith McNeil, the international program officer; and Tracy Fine, our executive assistant. This staff that we have put together over there thanks to my predecessors is just doing a tremendous job. I encourage all of you to be in touch with them as you attempt to engage in the work of the association.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, it is now my sad duty to inform the House of those people who served in Congress and have passed away since our report last year. They are:

William Robert Anderson of Tennessee

Lloyd Bensten of Texas

Joel Broyhill of Virginia

Clair Burgener of California

Helen Chenoweth-Hage of Idaho

Harold Collier of Illinois

N. Neiman Craley, Jr., of Pennsylvania

Steven B. Derounian of New York

Reverend Robert F. Drinan of Massachusetts

Thomas Eagleton of Missouri

President Gerald R. Ford of Michigan

Robert Giaimo of Connecticut

Ralph Harding of Idaho

Chic Hecht of Nevada

Jim Jontz of Indiana

Thomas S. Kleppe of North Dakota

Thomas Manton of New York

Robert Mathias of California

Jack Metcalf of Washington

Juanita Millender-McDonald of California

Sonny Montgomery of Mississippi

Charles W. Norwood, Jr., of Georgia

James Olin of Virginia

Charlotte Reid of Illinois

Theodore Risenhoover of Oklahoma

J.T. Rutherford of Texas

George A. Smathers of Florida

Virginia Smith of Nebraska

Marion Gene Snyder of Kentucky

Gerry Studds of Massachusetts

I ask all of you, including the visitors in the gallery, to rise for a moment of silence as we pay our respect to their memory.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, each year the Association presents a Distinguished Service Award to an out-

standing public servant and former Member of Congress. The award rotates between parties, as do our officers. This year, we are very pleased to be honoring a remarkable Republican, former Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole from Kansas, my home State.

General Colin Powell once described him as "a plainspoken man of strength, maturity and integrity." I know him as a fellow Kansan with an unconventional candor and prairie wit who loves his State and loves our country. We all know him as one of the most prominent political figures of our time and one of the legislative giants in our Nation's history.

Senator Robert Dole was born July 22, 1923 in Russell, Kansas. He has been quoted as saying, "Anyone who wants to understand me must first understand Russell, Kansas. It is my home, where my roots lie, and a constant source of strength. In Russell, I came to understand there are things worth living for, and, if need be, dying for."

Senator Dole served in World War II as a platoon leader in the legendary 10th Mountain Division in Italy. In 1945, he was gravely wounded on the battlefield, spent 39 months in the hospital, and was twice decorated for heroic achievement. His decorations including two Purple Hearts and a Bronze Star with Oak Leaf Cluster.

Senator Dole graduated from Washburn University in 1952 with a law degree and went on to represent then the Third District of Kansas, later what became known as the Big First, from 1961 to 1969. Elected to the U.S. Senate in 1968, Senator Dole served as either majority leader or minority leader from 1985 to 1996. He was chairman of the Committee on Finance during the 97th and 98th Congresses, as well as chairman of the Republican National Committee in 1971-72.

While serving in the Senate, Senator Dole earned national acclaim for his leadership on behalf of the disadvantaged and Americans with disabilities. He left his mark on many pieces of major legislation, ranging from farm bills to Social Security and food stamps. He was always a conservative and strong voice for fiscal responsibility.

In 1976, he was the GOP candidate for Vice President alongside President Gerald Ford. In 1996, Senator Dole was the Republican Party's candidate for President. In 1997, President Clinton recognized Senator Dole's remarkable career of public service by granting him a Presidential Medal of Freedom, our Nation's highest civilian honor.

Since his retirement from the Senate, Senator Dole has reestablished his law career here in Washington; has written a book called "One Soldier's Story: A Memoir"; served as chairman of the National World War II Memorial; and joined forces with President Bill Clinton to serve as cochair of the Families of Freedom Scholarship Fund, assisting the educational needs of the families of the World Trade Center, the

Pentagon and United Flight 93. Most recently, President Bush appointed Dole as chairman of the commission to investigate problems at Walter Reed Army Medical Center.

The Robert J. Dole Institute of Politics housed at the University of Kansas in Lawrence, Kansas, was established to encourage public service and promote bipartisanship and statesmanship in American politics.

I have often said that when the doors were closed and the tough work of governing had to be done, Bob Dole could be counted on to make the hard decisions that he believed were in the best interest of the country that he loves. That makes him in my mind a statesman and a great patriot.

On behalf of the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress, it is a great pleasure and honor for me to present our 2007 Distinguished Service Award to former Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole. Let me read the plaque as it is inscribed:

"Presented by the United States Association of Former Members of Congress to Senator Robert J. Dole of Kansas for a lifetime of dedicated and exceptional service to his country. Whether as an officer in World War II or as the highest ranking Republican in the U.S. Senate, Bob Dole has always exemplified strong and courageous leadership. He has received his Nation's highest honors, including the Presidential Medal of Freedom, two Purple Hearts, and the Bronze Star. He served as Senate majority leader and as his party's nominee for Vice President and for President. Bob Dole is a true American hero and his former colleagues from both sides of the political aisle salute him. Washington, DC, May 10, 2007."

Mr. RHODES. The Chair is pleased to recognize the Honorable Senator Robert Dole for such time as he wishes to consume.

Mr. DOLE. Well, I am pleased to have somebody with Kansas roots presiding. So thank you.

Mr. RHODES. The blood is there, Senator.

Mr. DOLE. Well, I never had this many people show up when I was in the House, so this is a big improvement over the 8 years I spent here.

I've been trying to get Slattery to use Grecian Formula. Once you get used to the taste, it works very well. I'll send him another bottle.

I've been thinking about this place and all the people here and some of whom I've served with. There are not many left anymore, but I see my friend Bob Michel here.

It will be 11 years on June 11 since I left the Capitol and 38 years this past January that I left this Chamber. Forty-six years ago I walked into this Chamber and didn't have a clue. I didn't know anything about anything. Maybe that happens even now, but I doubt it. Before I go any further, I want to recognize my wife, Elizabeth. Thank you for being here.

I just jotted down a few things. I always spoke on the 1-minute rule. Speaker McCormack was always very kind to give us a little time, but it was to say the least exciting to have a front row seat for somebody from Russell, Kansas, in the Congress of the United States. My hero, of course, was President Eisenhower. He was leaving Washington just as I was arriving. I remember shortly after he left, he invited our freshman class, all the Democrats and Republicans in our freshman class, to come to Gettysburg where he spent about 3 hours giving us a personal tour of the Gettysburg battlefield, and then we had lunch and he put us on a bus and waved good-bye. That is still one of the most memorable moments in my career, because whether you're a Democrat or Republican, Eisenhower was revered by people of all generations.

I came to Washington when John Kennedy was elected President, and I remember it very well, because there was a big, big snowstorm the night before the inaugural, and I was trapped in my office in the Cannon Building and I didn't have any clean shirt to wear and there was a drug store at that time right across the street, they even handled shirts, so I went over and bought me a fresh shirt and it was a very, very bitter cold day. I remember when President Kennedy gave his inaugural address, he challenged the Nation, all of us, Republicans, Democrats and led by a new generation because he was a new generation, as he said, "Tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world."

He went on, declaring, and this is a very famous quote that we all know about, that we would "pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival and the success of liberty." It is much the same today though we have maybe different ideas on how it is to be done.

I was thinking back about what really happened as far as legislative achievements in the 8 years and many things when I was here did happen, many things were important. I remember amendments to the national school lunch program and the food for peace program that was initiated by President Eisenhower. It was a nonpartisan program. I was here when I heard President Johnson proclaim, "We shall overcome." Here I was a conservative Republican, President Johnson a liberal southern Democrat, but we were as one on the defining issue of our times and the defining issue of our times was civil rights. I was here and proudly voted "aye" in 1964 when the first civil rights legislation was passed.

I remember Speaker Rayburn. I remember I used to grip the chair and he

was very quiet, very reserved. I never had a long conversation with him. I don't think many people did. But I served longer with John McCormack of Massachusetts, who was Speaker from 1962 to 1971. And then when I left the House and went to the Senate, I knew Carl Albert very well. He was a great guy and from Oklahoma. Tip O'Neill, Jim Wright, Tom Foley, Newt Gingrich.

I think of all the Speakers I knew, the one that I had the best rapport with was Tip O'Neill. I think Bob Michel might agree, because he would sit in his office and roll that cigar back and forth and have a conversation. He was just one of the finest politicians—and I use that word in the right sense—finest politicians I ever met. Politicians take a lot of beating which they don't deserve, but that's another topic.

But Tip O'Neill was a friend of another leader of this body, Gerald Ford. As many of you know, Gerald Ford's ambition was to become Speaker of the House. Well, he never made it, but he became Vice President and President of the United States which probably to him was a second prize. And I think we were all reminded earlier this year that history chose a good and decent man to heal the wounds of Watergate when President Ford was there.

I remember being asked, I can't remember by who, what I would do in the House. Well, my answer was to follow the advice of a late Senator from Kansas, Senator Frank Carlson, who told me to sit back and listen and then stand up for what you believe in. The truth is while I served here, I did what my parents taught me: You work hard, you keep your word, you treat others the way you want to be treated, and, of course, you do your best.

As Jim Slattery pointed out, I'm proud of my Kansas roots and I would not have made it here had it not been for my friends in Russell who sort of rallied around me after World War II. They taught me that the greatness of America lies not in the power of her government but in the goodness of her people. I owe my life to my family, to a lot of doctors and nurses in and out of Army hospitals, and many, many others.

Finally, age may or may not bestow wisdom, but it does carry certain privileges, among them the right to remember and perhaps distill whatever perspective comes with experience. As I reflect on my years in Congress and in Washington, what comes to mind first are not the legislative battles won or lost but the friendships forged for life. Thomas Jefferson said that "a friendship is precious not only in the shade but in the sunshine of life. And thanks to a benevolent arrangement of things, the greater part of life is sunshine." Much of the sunshine in my life stems from the privilege of serving in Congress and working with men and women of both parties.

I am very proud to receive this award. I have learned that if you live

long enough, you get a lot of awards, they're coming in pretty fast at my age, but I consider this a very distinct honor because I know how hard you all worked.

I would just close with, some of us at least, it may be a confession on my part. First I want to thank you for all you do. But somebody handed me a little poem called *Around the Corner*. Sometimes we get so busy and so maybe self-centered sometimes, this is what it is:

*Around the corner I have a friend,  
In this great city that has no end.  
Yet the days go by and weeks rush on,  
And before I know it, a year is gone.  
And I never see my old friend's face,  
For life is a swift and terrible race.  
He knows I like him just as well,  
As in the days when I rang his bell.  
And he rang mine but we were younger then,  
And now we are busy, tired men.  
Tired of playing a foolish game,  
Tired of trying to make a name.  
Tomorrow, I say, I will call on Jim,  
Just to show that I'm thinking of him.  
But tomorrow comes and tomorrow goes,  
And distance between us grows and grows.  
Around the corner, yet miles away,  
"Here's a telegram, sir." "Jim died today."  
And that's what we get and deserve in the end,  
Around the corner a vanished friend.*

Thank you.

Mr. SLATTERY. Senator Dole, one other thing we wanted to give you. This is two little booklets of congratulatory letters from your friends. We wanted to just present that to you, also.

Mr. RHODES. Our thanks to the Senator from the United States of America, Mr. Dole.

There are a couple of things I need to mention. We would be remiss if we did not recognize that we have several foreign visitors, Members of Parliament from Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the European Union and Great Britain. We appreciate your being with us and hope you'll enjoy the rest of the day with us.

Members who did not record their presence can come forward and record their presence verbally with the Reading Clerk. I need to mention to you that our buses are out on Independence Avenue. It would be helpful if you would proceed to those buses as if you were civilians rather than Congressmen.

Last, I want to recognize a voice that has not been heard here today. That is the voice of Paul Hays. Paul was the Reading Clerk in this House when each and every one of us was here. Paul has retired. I understand that there is to be a reception in Paul's honor this evening at 5 o'clock in the Rayburn Room.

I want to thank all of you for being here. Good luck to you.

The House of Representatives will reconvene in 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 8 minutes a.m.), the House continued in recess.



□ 1023

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY) at 10 o'clock and 23 minutes a.m.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1082. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize drug and device user fees and ensure the safety of medical products, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. Con. Res. 21) entitled "Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 and 2009 through 2012", agrees to a conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CONRAD, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. GREGG, and Mr. DOMENICI, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

## PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. SESTAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that all Members and former Members who spoke during the recess have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 10 one-minute speeches on each side.

## IT IS TIME TO ENACT A COMPREHENSIVE ENERGY POLICY

(Mr. BUTTERFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it seems that every year as we close in on Memorial Day, gas prices sky-rocket to new record highs. Unfortunately, this year there is no exception.

For 6 years under Republican leadership, Congress has failed to enact a comprehensive energy strategy needed to help stabilize the price of gas and make America more energy independent. Under the Republican leadership, energy policy was little more

than corporate welfare, handing over billions of dollars in tax breaks to oil companies and gas companies experiencing record profits. As a result of those policies, American families are paying a higher price every time they go to the pump.

Under the new leadership, this House has already supported a rollback of those multi-billion dollar taxpayer subsidies to big oil companies so that we can invest in efficiency and renewable forms of energy.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to help the working families struggle to pay the prices at the pump. We must bring down prices and make America energy independent. With a comprehensive energy policy we can and should and will accomplish this goal.

## MENTAL HEALTH SECURITY FOR AMERICA'S FAMILIES IN EDUCATION

(Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it has been a few short weeks since the tragedies of Virginia Tech, which we cannot forget. Nor should we forget the fact that there are three suicides each day on college campuses and each year hundreds of thousands of acts of violence, many committed by those who have serious mental illness.

But under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, passed into law in 1974, school personnel, administrators, and teachers who have little or no training in mental health are burdened with the task of defining and determining if a student is at risk. These educational personnel are also reluctant to release information for fear of legal action.

That is why I have introduced H.R. 2220, the Mental Health Security for America's Families in Education Act, to break down these barriers to allow our schools to communicate with parents after consultation with a licensed mental health professional.

I ask my colleagues to join the Association of American Universities, the American Council on Education, and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges to help support this bill.

## THE WAR IN IRAQ

(Mr. SESTAK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SESTAK. Mr. Speaker, we are at the point where no one should call the war in Iraq "Bush's war." It is ours, America's war. We are in this together. We Democrats need the Republicans if we are to end it without a failed Iraqi state.

It is not just about "getting out of Iraq." It should be about redeploying out of Iraq so that we can better ensure

U.S. security elsewhere, as we leave Iraq with relative stability.

The resolution we will soon vote on is today's stalking horse, with merit, but with less of a strategic plan for a successful end than the last Iraqi resolution, despite times that are now more dire in Iraq and, therefore, also for us. We need both the Republicans and a new strategy so that we can successfully end this conflict for our betterment. I see the key as President Bush's statement that our commitment is not open-ended. We, therefore, now need to define how to end it, together.

I will vote for this resolution, but I am expressing my reservations because it lacks defining how to achieve the end of an open-ended commitment by a winning strategy.

That is why we need the Republicans, and they us, to resolve the war successfully by a strategy that deliberately defines the end of our open-ended commitment so that we can then use it to exact success, diplomatically, regionally, ensuring our, and Iraqis', greater security.

## HELPING TERRORISTS

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, there is a fundamental disagreement in this House of Representatives over how to protect our Nation and our approach to national security. And these differences are no more blatant than in the Department of Homeland Security authorization bill that passed this House just yesterday.

While law enforcement officials were arresting six potential terrorists who planned to attack a military base in New Jersey, this Democrat majority was already working hard to strip commonsense immigration reforms from the authorization bill. Never mind that three of the would-be terrorists were in the country illegally, never mind that stronger enforcement and better resources for our Customs and Border agents could have very well kept these men from getting across the border.

It is outrageous that this majority would proactively undermine an opportunity to strengthen our Nation's defenses, support our first responders, and track who is coming into our country.

American common sense appears not to have extended to the majority party. There are fundamental differences in how we plan to protect America. Our enemies are watching and so are the American people.

□ 1030

## EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL

(Mr. HALL of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Speaker, today this House is again going to consider legislation that would heed the

will of the American people by changing course in Iraq and paving the way for responsible redeployment of our troops.

Although the President claims that he is interested in cooperation with Congress, his most recent veto threat shows that to him cooperation still means, "I'm the decider, you will do what I say." Well, the American people feel differently. The President is going to have to acknowledge that his course in Iraq is the wrong course, and that it is time to abandon this approach and work with Congress.

The bill we are considering today funds our troops, enhances our ability to go after al Qaeda and ensures benchmarks for the Iraqi Government that will ensure we are not on a road to nowhere in Iraq.

This bill sets the stage for responsible winding down of our military involvement in Iraq, and I urge my colleagues to support it and the President to sign it.

#### DEMOCRATS' PLAN DOESN'T CUT IT

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the supplemental bill we are set to consider today only partially funds our troops. This leaves the possibility that Democratic leaders will again seek to undercut the efforts of General Petraeus before August. The plan is equivalent of an oil change when the car needs new tires.

President Bush pledged yesterday to veto the new Democrat funding bill. The President's veto supports our troops to complete the mission. Secretary of Defense Robert Gates has made clear the impact on the military of partial funding. He has said, "In essence, the bill asks me to run the Department of Defense like a skiff, and I'm trying to drive the biggest supertanker in the world."

Following their failed attempt to micromanage our military leaders and hamstringing our troops in the battlefield, I am saddened that many Democrats are not facing up to the threats to our security. Al Qaeda spokesman Zawahiri has declared Iraq the central front in the global war on terrorism.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

#### IN SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES COMMITMENT TO GLOBAL CHILD SURVIVAL ACT

(Ms. MCCOLLUM Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, today I will introduce a bipartisan piece of legislation that will keep newborn babies and young children alive and healthy in the world's poorest countries. I urge my colleagues to

cosponsor the United States Commitment to the Global Child Survival Act.

Every year, more than 10 million newborns and children under 5 die. That is 28,000 babies and toddlers dying every day. Pneumonia, diarrhea and malnutrition needlessly kill millions. Sixty percent of newborns and young children die needlessly from treatable or preventable problems just because they are poor.

This bill expands access to the basics, antibiotics, vaccines, vitamins, antimalaria drugs, which will save lives.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the United States Commitment to the Global Child Survival Act and to invest in keeping newborns and young children and their mothers healthy.

#### DON'T WITHDRAW FROM IRAQ

(Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a petition signed by nearly 3,000 men and women currently serving in Iraq was accepted by the House of Representatives by Leader BOEHNER. The appeal simply states, "As an American currently serving my nation in uniform, I respectfully urge my political leaders in Congress to fully support our mission in Iraq and halt any calls for retreat. The war in Iraq is a necessary and just effort to bring freedom to the Middle East and protect America from further attacks."

This petition was organized by two U.S. servicemen serving in Iraq, Lieutenant Jason Nichols and Staff Sergeant David Thul. In a statement released yesterday, they said, "We are respectfully asking for full support in finishing the mission you assigned us here in Iraq. Patience and resolve will result in a stable democratic country in the Middle East. Early withdrawal will result in a stronger enemy, a weaker America and a demoralized united armed forces. We need your support to finish the job."

Mr. Speaker, these are the thoughts of men and women fighting this war. We owe it to them to listen. They've earned it.

#### 2008 BUDGET

(Ms. SCHWARTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHWARTZ. As a Member of the Budget Committee, I am proud of the 2008 budget that we sent to conference committee this week. Our budget is a responsible one, and it is attentive to America's priorities.

First, our budget honors our commitment to our service men and women. It provides funding that will enable our veterans' health system to meet increasing needs.

Second, our budget recognizes the priorities of hard-working Americans.

It provides tax relief to middle-income families by fixing the AMT, extending lower tax rates, and continuing the earned income and child tax credits. And it expands SCHIP to provide health coverage to 7 million children of middle-income families who are currently uninsured.

Third, our budget enhances our Nation's economic competitiveness. It makes key investments to ensure our future workforce has the education and skills needed to compete in the global economy. Our budget is fiscally disciplined. It ends the unsustainable "borrow-and-spend" policies of the last 6 years. And it balances the budget in 5 years, setting us on a course to pay down our debt while meeting our obligations.

We should all be proud of this budget. It is a new direction; it is the right direction for America.

#### COMMEMORATING THE 100TH BACH CHOIR FESTIVAL

(Mr. DENT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the distinguished Bach choir of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, our Nation's oldest choir dedicated to the performance and celebration of musical masterpieces composed by Johann Sebastian Bach. Founded in 1898 under the direction of J. Fred Wolle, the organist of the Bethlehem Moravian Church, the choir is celebrating the 100th anniversary of the annual Bach Festival this month.

In 1900, the Bach choir presented their first performance of "The Mass in B Minor" in the Moravian Church in Bethlehem during the Bach Festival. Although the next Bach Festival was not held again until 1912, the Festival has blossomed into a long-standing cultural tradition in Bethlehem, attracting visitors from all around the Nation and the world each year. During the festival, the choir will once again breathe life into Bach's Mass in B Minor.

Since its inception, the choir has been a shining star in the city of Bethlehem. Today, the choir is comprised of 95 volunteer members and performs under the leadership and direction of Greg Funfgeld. This unique ensemble has gained international acclaim for their artistry. The choir has been welcomed to perform on some of the most renowned stages in the world, including the Kennedy Center, Carnegie Hall, Munich's Royal Residence, as well as London's Royal Albert Hall as part of a concert tour in the United Kingdom.

Furthermore, countless listeners have tuned in across the globe to listen to the choir on National Public Radio and the BBC World Service. The discipline and talent that ushers this choir around the world is also shared with children and the young musicians in Lehigh Valley through music education programs.

I would just like to commend all the good people at the Bach choir and congratulate them on this 100th anniversary of the Bach Festival.

#### IRAQI HYDROCARBON LAW

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. The administration sets several benchmarks for the Iraqi Government, including the passage of the hydrocarbon law by the parliament. The administration misled this Congress by emphasizing only a small part of this law, the so-called "fair" distribution of oil revenues.

Consider the fact that the Iraqi hydrocarbon law contains a mere three sentences that generally discuss the "fair" distribution of oil. Except for these three scant lines, the entire 33-page hydrocarbon bill is about creating a complex legal structure to facilitate the privatization of Iraqi oil. As a matter of fact, yesterday, Vice President CHENEY was in Baghdad specifically to tell the Iraqi legislature they must stay in session to pass this hydrocarbon bill which hands Iraqi oil over to foreign oil companies.

It is imperative that all of us look at this carefully before we cast our vote today.

Mr. Speaker, this war will never end if the Iraqi people believe the U.S. government is trying to deliver its oil over to U.S. oil companies.

#### HONORING ASTRONAUT WALTER "WALLY" SCHIRRA

(Mr. BILBRAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of a life of accomplishment of astronaut Walter "Wally" Schirra and express the condolences of a grateful Nation to his entire family.

Wally passed away last Thursday at the age of 84, leaving behind a wife, Josephine, and daughter, Suzanne, and Walter Schirra III.

In a world where we place a premium on innovation and discovery, Wally was a pioneer in both.

Mr. Speaker, the history of man is measured on a timeline of exploration, and for Walter Schirra, it was his life. Pushing the limits of discovery, determined to work harder and go farther than anyone before him, Wally had the distinction of being the fifth American in space and the third American in orbit on an adventure that includes six circlings of the globe that lasted more than 9 hours.

He led a lifetime built on breaking barriers, laying the groundwork for future lunar landings. On December 15, 1965, he piloted the Gemini 6 in what was to be the first attempted rendezvous by two-manned spacecraft in space. Three years later, in October of

1968, he concluded his third and final mission when he was launched as commander of Apollo 7, the first manned Apollo mission. This flight made Commander Schirra the only Mercury astronaut to fly aboard Mercury, Gemini and Apollo spacecrafts.

His lifetime of achievement also included a decorated record of service in the United States military. In Korea, he flew 90 combat missions and was credited with downing at least one MIG fighter. His courage and valor was eventually recognized with three distinguished flying crosses, two air medals and two NASA Distinguished Service Medals and induction into the National Aviation Hall of Fame.

While he was remembered most for his contributions in the United States space program, Wally also made tremendous strides in advancing the efforts of the Reuben H. Fleet Aerospace Museum in San Diego.

While he was no longer to venture out into outer space, Wally took off on his 35-foot sailboat. I guess he figured if the skies were no longer available to him, he would instead canvass the oceans.

Astronaut "Wally" Schirra will always have a place in our Nation's history, an inspiring figure of humble beginnings with daring dreams, a pioneer of our space program who helped the United States win the race against the Soviet Union in the space race.

While we mourn the loss of this remarkable man, we should celebrate his great life of achievements. We can rest assured that his legacy will be long felt by many generations yet to come.

#### DEMOCRATS ARE WILLING TO WORK WITH THE PRESIDENT BUT WE ARE NOT GOING TO RUBBER-STAMP HIS WAR

(Mr. RODRIGUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, Iraq must be held responsible. No one can be forced to have a democracy; they must want to themselves.

The Iraqi government must meet the security, political and economic benchmarks that they have set for themselves. I would think that every Member of this Congress would want to hold the Iraqi Government accountable for the promises it has made earlier this year.

On our supplemental, the bill fully funds the troops for the next 2 to 3 months, ensuring that they have everything they need to conduct their mission. The bill includes additional funding to include improve military readiness above the President's request. The bill includes additional \$1.8 billion for veterans' health care above the President's request. The bill also includes additional funding for the troops above what the President has requested. It is time for us to hold the Iraqi government responsible and ask them to come

up to the plate as we have done ourselves.

#### ALLOW AMERICANS TO KEEP THEIR MONEY

(Mr. CAMPBELL of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Speaker, we learned this week that in April of this year, the Federal Government received more tax revenue in that month than in any month ever in the history of the Republic. It results in an over 11 percent increase in revenue to the government this year, on top of over an 11 percent increase last year and an almost 15 percent increase the year before that. But, yet, the budget that the Democrats propose includes the largest tax increase in American history as they continue to impose tax increase after tax increase after tax increase. The question is, why? When Federal Government revenues have increased over 37 percent in the last 3 years, why do we want to increase spending by 40 percent in 3 years, 50 percent, 60 percent? Why? We should not be confiscating more money from the people in order to increase government. We should be allowing the people to keep more of their own money so that the economy can continue to grow.

#### SUPPORT OUR TROOPS AND BRING THEM HOME

(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, more than 4 years ago the House of Representatives authorized a war in Iraq based on misrepresentations that were false, \$2 billion a week and climbing. Today, we have an opportunity to support our troops and bring them home when the House will vote to fully fund the safe and timely withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq. Last November, the American people gave Congress an overwhelming mandate to end the occupation of Iraq.

On this day, Mr. Speaker, we can decide whether we stand with the President to continue to support a failed policy with no end, or stand with the American people and our generals, who understand there is no military solution to this civil war and occupation in Iraq.

H.R. 2237 reflects the goal of the Lee amendment to fully fund the safe and timely withdrawal of our troops from Iraq. It is responsible, it is practical, it does not cut the funding. But it designates what the supplemental can be used for, and that is to fully fund a safe withdrawal and redeployment and help the Iraqis stabilize their country with a diplomatic, social, and reconstruction effort.

This occupation cannot be won militarily. I urge my colleagues to support

the goals of H.R. 2237 and to vote for it, because those of us who worked so hard on the Lee amendment prior to today support this and want to see a strong vote for it.

□ 1045

#### CONGRESS SUPPORTS EDUCATION IN TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

(Mr. ETHERIDGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, as a former school chief serving in Congress, I rise today to commemorate National Teacher Appreciation Week.

All across America this week, our Nation's school children, parents, PTAs and others are gathering to show their appreciation to the professional educators who work every day to make their futures brighter. Teacher Appreciation Week is a great opportunity to stop and pay tribute to the profession that shapes the world of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to note that this new Democratic Congress is doing its part to support education in our communities. Democrats rejected President Bush's misguided educational budget cuts. Earlier this year, the House passed a balanced budget resolution that provides billions of dollars more for the non-neglected priorities like Head Start, secondary education, the Individuals With Disability Act and important initiatives.

In addition, my colleagues and I have crafted bipartisan legislation to provide critical investment in our school construction and modernization across this country. The Rangel-Ramstad-Etheridge America Better Classrooms Act will provide \$25 billion in interest-free bonds for local schools. This bill will make a difference in our communities, our children and our teachers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in this piece of legislation on National Teacher Appreciation Week.

#### CELEBRATING THE LIFE AND MEMORY OF KATIE M. SOENKSEN

(Mr. BRALEY of Iowa asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life and the memory of PFC Katie Soenksen, who graduated from Davenport North High School in 2005 and died in an explosion on May 2 in West Baghdad, Iraq, while conducting a security mission in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Katie was a 19-year-old woman from Davenport, Iowa, who was a member of the 410th Military Police Company from Fort Hood, Texas. She left behind a loving family, including her parents, Ron and Mary Ann Soenksen, a brother, Matthew, from Davenport, and a sister, Sarah, from Blue Springs, Missouri.

Katie's friends and family remember her as a fun-loving, energetic young

woman who loved bowling, playing softball and spending time with her friends.

Mr. Speaker, as we come to the floor every day and decide important public policy issues that affect the lives of people like Katie Soenksen, I hope we all remember that this is something we are all in together, and the lives of future generations of Americans are affected by the policies that we set on this floor.

#### CONGRATULATING THE CITY OF CHICAGO FOR BEING CHOSEN TO REPRESENT THE UNITED STATES TO HOST THE 2016 OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

Mr. SIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28) congratulating the City of Chicago for being chosen to represent the United States in the international competition to host 2016 Olympic and Paralympic Games, and encouraging the International Olympic Committee to select Chicago as the site of the 2016 Olympic and Paralympic Games, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 28

Whereas the City of Chicago has been selected by the United States Olympic Committee to represent the United States in its bid to host the 2016 Summer Olympic and Paralympic Games;

Whereas by 2016, 20 years will have passed since the Summer Olympics were held in a city in the United States;

Whereas Chicago is a world-class city with remarkable diversity, culture, history, and people;

Whereas the citizens of Chicago take great pride in all aspects of their city and have a deep love for sports;

Whereas Chicago already holds a place in the international community as a city of immigrants from around the world, who are eager to be ambassadors to visiting Olympic athletes;

Whereas the Olympic and Paralympic Games will be played in the heart of Chicago so that athletes and visitors can appreciate the beauty of the downtown parks and lakefront;

Whereas Chicago is one of the transportation hubs of the world and can provide accessible transportation to international visitors through extensive rail, transit, and motorways infrastructure, combined with the world-class O'Hare and Midway International Airports;

Whereas the motto of the 2016 Olympic and Paralympic Games in Chicago would be "Stir the Soul," and the games would inspire citizens around the world, both young and old;

Whereas a Midwestern city has not hosted the Olympic Games since the 1904 games in St. Louis, Missouri, and the opportunity to

host the Olympics would be an achievement not only for Chicago and for the State of Illinois, but also for the entire Midwest;

Whereas hosting the 2016 Olympic and Paralympic Games would provide substantial local, regional, and national economic benefits;

Whereas Mayor Richard M. Daley, Patrick Ryan, and members of the Chicago 2016 Committee have campaigned tirelessly to secure Chicago's bid to host the Olympic and Paralympic Games;

Whereas through the campaign to be selected by the United States Olympic Committee, Chicago's citizens, officials, workers, community groups, and businesses have demonstrated their ability to come together to exemplify the true spirit of the Olympic Games and the City of Chicago; and

Whereas the Olympic and Paralympic Games represent the best of the human spirit and there is no better fit for hosting this event than one of the world's truly great cities: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—*

(1) congratulates the City of Chicago on securing the bid to represent the United States in the international competition to host the 2016 Olympic and Paralympic Games; and

(2) encourages the International Olympic Committee to select Chicago as the site of the 2016 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SMALL BUSINESS FAIRNESS IN CONTRACTING ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 383 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1873.

□ 1050

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1873) to reauthorize the programs and activities of the Small Business Administration relating to procurement, and for other purposes, with Mr. CROWLEY (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, May 9, 2007, amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 110-137 by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 4, as modified, by Mr. SESTAK of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. SHULER of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 3 by Ms. BEAN of Illinois.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 4, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY  
MR. SESTAK

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SESTAK), as modified, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Amendment No. 4, as modified, offered by Mr. SESTAK:

Strike section 101 and insert the following:  
**SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS OF BUNDLING OF CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS AND RELATED TERMS.**

Section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632) is amended by amending subsection (o) to read as follows:

“(o) DEFINITIONS OF BUNDLING OF CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS AND RELATED TERMS.—For purposes of this Act:

“(1) BUNDLED CONTRACT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘bundled contract’ means a contract or order that is entered into to meet procurement requirements that are consolidated in a bundling of contract requirements, without regard to its designation by the procuring agency or whether a study of the effects of the solicitation on civilian or military personnel has been made.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The term does not include—

“(i) a contract or order with an aggregate dollar value below the dollar threshold specified in paragraph (4); or

“(ii) a contract or order that is entered into to meet procurement requirements, all of which are exempted requirements under paragraph (5).

“(2) BUNDLING OF CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘bundling of contract requirements’ means the use of any bundling methodology to satisfy 2 or more procurement requirements for goods or services previously supplied or performed under separate smaller contracts or orders, or to satisfy 2 or more procurement requirements for construction services of a type historically performed under separate smaller contracts or orders, that is likely to be unsuitable for award to a small business concern due to—

“(i) the diversity, size, or specialized nature of the elements of the performance specified;

“(ii) the aggregate dollar value of the anticipated award;

“(iii) the geographical dispersion of the contract or order performance sites; or

“(iv) any combination of the factors described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii).

“(B) INCLUSION OF NEW FEATURES OR FUNCTIONS.—A combination of contract requirements that would meet the definition of a bundling of contract requirements but for the addition of a procurement requirement with at least one new good or service shall be considered to be a bundling of contract requirements unless the new features or functions substantially transform the goods or services and will provide measurably substantial benefits to the government in terms of quality, performance, or price.

“(C) EXCEPTIONS.—The term does not include—

“(i) the use of a bundling methodology for an anticipated award with an aggregate dollar value below the dollar threshold specified in paragraph (5); or

“(ii) the use of a bundling methodology to meet procurement requirements, all of which are exempted requirements under paragraph (6).

“(3) BUNDLING METHODOLOGY.—The term ‘bundling methodology’ means—

“(A) a solicitation to obtain offers for a single contract or order, or a multiple award contract or order; or

“(B) a solicitation of offers for the issuance of a task or a delivery order under an existing single or multiple award contract or order.

“(4) SEPARATE SMALLER CONTRACT.—The term ‘separate smaller contract’, with respect to bundling of contract requirements, means a contract or order that has been performed by 1 or more small business concerns or was suitable for award to 1 or more small business concerns.

“(5) DOLLAR THRESHOLD.—The term ‘dollar threshold’ means \$65,000,000, if solely for construction services.

“(6) EXEMPTED REQUIREMENTS.—The term ‘exempted requirement’ means a procurement requirement solely for items that are not commercial items (as the term ‘commercial item’ is defined in section 4(12) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(12)).

“(7) PROCUREMENT REQUIREMENT.—The term ‘procurement requirement’ means a determination by an agency that a specified good or service is needed to satisfy the mission of the agency.”.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 423, noes 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 319]

AYES—423

Abercrombie	Brown-Waite,	Davis (KY)	Gallegly	Lungren, Daniel	Rothman
Ackerman	Ginny	Davis, David	Garrett (NJ)	E.	Roybal-Allard
Aderholt	Buchanan	Davis, Jo Ann	Gerlach	Lynch	Royce
Akin	Burgess	Davis, Lincoln	Giffords	Mack	Ruppersberger
Alexander	Burton (IN)	Davis, Tom	Gilchrest	Mahoney (FL)	Rush
Allen	Buyer	Deal (GA)	Gillibrand	Maloney (NY)	Ryan (OH)
Altmiere	Calvert	DeFazio	Gillmor	Manzullo	Ryan (WI)
Andrews	Camp (MI)	DeGette	Gohmert	Marchant	Salazar
Arcuri	Campbell (CA)	DeLauro	Gonzalez	Markey	Sali
Baca	Cannon	Dent	Goode	Marshall	Sánchez, Linda
Bachmann	Cantor	Diaz-Balart, L.	Matheson	T.	Sanchez, Loretta
Bachus	Capito	Diaz-Balart, M.	Matsui	Sanbanes	Sarbanes
Baird	Capps	Dicks	McCarthy (CA)	Saxton	Schakowsky
Baker	Capuano	Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Schiff	Schmidt
Baldwin	Cardoza	Doggett	McCaul (TX)	Schwartz	Scott (GA)
Barrett (SC)	Carnahan	Donnelly	McCollum (MN)	Scott (VA)	Sensenbrenner
Barrow	Carney	Doolittle	McCotter	Serrano	Sessions
Bartlett (MD)	Carson	Doyle	McCrery	Sestak	Shadegg
Barton (TX)	Carter	Drake	McDermott	Shays	Shea-Porter
Bean	Castle	Dreier	McGovern	Sherman	Shimkus
Becerra	Chabot	Duncan	McHenry	Shuler	Shuster
Berkley	Chandler	Edwards	McHugh	Simpson	Sires
Berman	Christensen	Ehlers	McIntyre	Skeltton	Miller, Gary
Berry	Clarke	Ellison	McKeon	Slaughter	Miller, George
Biggert	Clay	Ellsworth	McNerney	Smith (NE)	Mitchell
Bilbray	Cleaver	Emanuel	McNulty	Smith (NJ)	Mollohan
Bilirakis	Clyburn	Emerson	Meehan	Smith (TX)	Moore (KS)
Bishop (GA)	Coble	English (PA)	Meeks (NY)	Smith (WA)	Moore (WI)
Bishop (NY)	Cohen	Eshoo	Melancon	Snyder	Moran (KS)
Blackburn	Cole (OK)	Etheridge	Mica	Solis	Moran (VA)
Blumenauer	Conaway	Everett	Michaud	Space	Murphy (CT)
Blunt	Conyers	Faleomavaega	Miller (FL)	Spratt	Murphy, Patrick
Boehner	Cooper	Fallin	Miller (MI)	Stark	Murphy, Tim
Bonner	Costa	Farr	Miller (NC)	Stearns	Murtha
Bono	Costello	Feeney	Mills (NY)	Stupak	Musgrave
Boozman	Courtney	Ferguson	Moore (KS)	Sullivan	Myrick
Bordallo	Cramer	Flake	Moran (VA)	Sutton	Nadler
Boren	Crenshaw	Forbes	Murphy (CT)	Tancredito	Napolitano
Boswell	Crowley	Fortenberry	Murphy, Patrick	Tanner	Neal (MA)
Boucher	Cubin	Fortuño	Murphy, Tim	Tauscher	Neugebauer
Boustany	Cuellar	Fossella	Murphy, Tim	Taylor	Norton
Boyd (FL)	Culberson	Fox	Murphy, Tim	Terry	Nunes
Boyd (KS)	Cummings	Frank (MA)	Murphy, Tim	Thompson (CA)	Oberstar
Brady (TX)	Davis (AL)	Franks (AZ)	Murphy, Tim	Thompson (MS)	Obe
Braley (IA)	Davis (CA)	Frelinghuysen	Murphy, Tim	Thornberry	Olver
Brown (SC)	Davis (IL)		Murphy, Tim	Tiahrt	Ortiz
Brown, Corrine			Murphy, Tim	Tiberi	Pallone
			Murphy, Tim	Tierney	Pascarell
			Murphy, Tim	Towns	Pastor
			Murphy, Tim	Turner	Paul
			Murphy, Tim	Udall (CO)	Payne
			Murphy, Tim	Udall (NM)	Pearce
			Murphy, Tim	Upton	Pence
			Murphy, Tim	Van Hollen	Perlmuter
			Murphy, Tim	Velázquez	Peterson (MN)
			Murphy, Tim	Visclosky	Peterson (PA)
			Murphy, Tim	Walberg	Petri
			Murphy, Tim	Walden (OR)	Pickering
			Murphy, Tim	Walsh (NY)	Pitts
			Murphy, Tim	Walz (MN)	Platts
			Murphy, Tim	Wamp	Poe
			Murphy, Tim	Wasserman	Pomeroy
			Murphy, Tim	Schultz	Porter
			Murphy, Tim	Waters	Price (GA)
			Murphy, Tim	Watt	Price (NC)
			Murphy, Tim	Waxman	Pryce (OH)
			Murphy, Tim	Weiner	Putnam
			Murphy, Tim	Welch (VT)	Radanovich
			Murphy, Tim	Weldon (FL)	Rahall
			Murphy, Tim	Weller	Ramstad
			Murphy, Tim	Westmoreland	Rangel
			Murphy, Tim	Wexler	Regula
			Murphy, Tim	Whitfield	Rehberg
			Murphy, Tim	Wicker	Reichert
			Murphy, Tim	Wilson (NM)	Renzi
			Murphy, Tim	Wilson (OH)	Reyes
			Murphy, Tim	Wilson (SC)	Reynolds
			Murphy, Tim	Wolf	Rodriguez
			Murphy, Tim	Woolsey	Rogers (KY)
			Murphy, Tim	Wu	Rogers (MI)
			Murphy, Tim	Wynn	Rohrabacher
			Murphy, Tim	Yarmuth	Ros-Lehtinen
			Murphy, Tim	Young (AK)	Roskam
			Murphy, Tim	Young (FL)	Ross

## NOT VOTING—14

Bishop (UT)	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Brady (PA)	Jones (OH)	Souder
Butterfield	Larson (CT)	Watson
Engel	McMorris	
Fattah	Rodgers	
Gingrey	Meek (FL)	

□ 1116

Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. McKEON changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SHULER

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. SHULER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. SHULER:

After section 201 insert the following (and redesignate succeeding sections accordingly):

**SEC. 202. INCLUDE OVERSEAS CONTRACTS IN SMALL BUSINESS GOAL.**

Section 15(g) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(g)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) The procurement goals required by this subsection apply to all procurement contracts, without regard to whether the contract is for work within or outside the United States.”.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 398, noes 29, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 320]

AYES—398

Abercrombie	Boehner	Castle
Ackerman	Bonner	Castor
Aderholt	Bono	Chabot
Akin	Boozman	Chandler
Alexander	Bordallo	Christensen
Allen	Boren	Clarke
Altmire	Boswell	Clay
Andrews	Boucher	Cleaver
Arcuri	Boustany	Clyburn
Baca	Boyd (FL)	Coble
Bachmann	Boyd (KS)	Cohen
Bachus	Brady (TX)	Cole (OK)
Baird	Braley (IA)	Conyers
Baker	Brown (SC)	Cooper
Baldwin	Brown, Corrine	Costa
Barrett (SC)	Buchanan	Costello
Barrow	Burton (IN)	Courtney
Bartlett (MD)	Butterfield	Cramer
Barton (TX)	Buyer	Crenshaw
Bean	Calvert	Crowley
Becerra	Camp (MI)	Cubin
Berkley	Campbell (CA)	Cuellar
Berman	Capito	Culberson
Berry	Capps	Cummings
Bilirakis	Capuano	Davis (AL)
Bishop (GA)	Cardoza	Davis (CA)
Bishop (NY)	Carnahan	Davis (IL)
Bishop (UT)	Carney	Davis (KY)
Blackburn	Carson	Davis, David
Blumenauer	Carter	Davis, Jo Ann

Davis, Lincoln	Kaptur	Pitts
DeFazio	Keller	Platts
DeGette	Kennedy	Pomeroy
Delahunt	Kildee	Porter
DeLauro	Kilpatrick	Price (NC)
Dent	Kind	Pryce (OH)
Diaz-Balart, L.	King (IA)	Putnam
Diaz-Balart, M.	King (NY)	Radanovich
Dicks	Kingston	Rahall
Dingell	Kirk	Ramstad
Doggett	Klein (FL)	Rangel
Donnelly	Kline (MN)	Regula
Doyle	Knollenberg	Rehberg
Drake	Kucinich	Reichert
Duncan	Kuhl (NY)	Renzi
Edwards	LaHood	Reyes
Ehlers	Lampson	Reynolds
Ellison	Langevin	Rodriguez
Ellsworth	Lantos	Rogers (KY)
Emanuel	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (MI)
Emerson	Latham	Rohrabacher
English (PA)	LaTourette	Ros-Lehtinen
Eshoo	Lee	Roskam
Etheridge	Levin	Ross
Everett	Lewis (CA)	Rothman
Faleomavaega	Lewis (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Fallin	Lewis (KY)	Ruppersberger
Farr	Linder	Rush
Feeney	Lipinski	Ryan (OH)
Ferguson	LoBiondo	Ryan (WI)
Filner	Loeb	Salazar
Forbes	Loeb	Sánchez, Linda
Fortenberry	Lofgren, Zoe	T.
Fortuño	Lowey	Sanchez, Loretta
Fossella	Lucas	Sarbanes
Frank (MA)	Lynch	Saxton
Franks (AZ)	Mack	Schakowsky
Frelinghuysen	Mahoney (FL)	Schiff
Galleghy	Maloney (NY)	Schmidt
Garrett (NJ)	Manzullo	Schwartz
Gerlach	Marchant	Scott (GA)
Giffords	Markey	Scott (VA)
Gilchrest	Marshall	Serrano
Gillibrand	Matheson	Sessions
Gillmor	Matsui	Sestak
Gohmert	McCarthy (CA)	Shays
Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)	Shea-Porter
Goode	McCauley (TX)	Sherman
Goodlatte	McCollum (MN)	Shimkus
Gordon	McCotter	Shuler
Granger	McCrery	Shuster
Graves	McDermott	Simpson
Green, Al	McGovern	Sires
Green, Gene	McHugh	Skelton
Grijalva	McIntyre	Slaughter
Gutierrez	McKeon	Smith (NE)
Hall (NY)	McNerney	Smith (NJ)
Hall (TX)	McNulty	Smith (TX)
Hare	Meehan	Smith (WA)
Harman	Meeks (NY)	Snyder
Hastert	Melancon	Solis
Hastings (FL)	Mica	Space
Hastings (WA)	Michaud	Spratt
Hayes	Miller (FL)	Stark
Heller	Miller (MI)	Stupak
Herger	Miller (NC)	Sullivan
Herseth Sandlin	Miller, Gary	Sutton
Higgins	Miller, George	Tancred
Hill	Mitchell	Tanner
Hinchey	Mollohan	Tauscher
Hinojosa	Moore (KS)	Taylor
Hirono	Moore (WI)	Terry
Hobson	Moran (KS)	Thompson (CA)
Hodes	Moran (VA)	Thompson (MS)
Hoekstra	Murphy (CT)	Thornberry
Holden	Murphy, Patrick	Tiahrt
Holt	Murphy, Tim	Tiberi
Honda	Murtha	Tierney
Hooley	Musgrave	Towns
Hoyer	Nadler	Turner
Hulshof	Napolitano	Udall (CO)
Hunter	Neal (MA)	Udall (NM)
Inglis (SC)	Neugebauer	Upton
Insee	Norton	Van Hollen
Israel	Nunes	Velázquez
Issa	Oberstar	Visclosky
Jackson (IL)	Obey	Walberg
Jackson-Lee	Oliver	Walden (OR)
(TX)	Ortiz	Walsh (NY)
Jefferson	Pallone	Walsh (MN)
Jindal	Pascarell	Wamp
Johnson (GA)	Pastor	Wasserman
Johnson (IL)	Paul	Schultz
Johnson, E. B.	Payne	Waters
Johnson, Sam	Pearce	Watt
Jones (OH)	Pence	Waxman
Jordan	Perlmutter	Weiner
Kagen	Peterson (MN)	Welch (VT)
Kanjorski	Peterson (PA)	Weldon (FL)
	Pickering	

Weller	Wilson (OH)	Wynn
Wexler	Wilson (SC)	Yarmuth
Whitfield	Wolf	Young (AK)
Wicker	Woolsey	Young (FL)
Wilson (NM)	Wu	

## NOES—29

Biggert	Doolittle	Petri
Bilbray	Dreier	Poe
Blunt	Flake	Price (GA)
Brown-Waite,	Fox	Royce
Ginny	Gingrey	Sali
Burgess	Hensarling	Sensenbrenner
Cannon	Lamborn	Shadegg
Cantor	Lungren, Daniel	Stearns
Conaway	E.	Westmoreland
Davis, Tom	McHenry	
Deal (GA)	Myrick	

## NOT VOTING—10

Brady (PA)	Larson (CT)	Rogers (AL)
Engel	McMorris	Souder
Fattah	Rodgers	Watson
Jones (NC)	Meek (FL)	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes left in the vote.

□ 1126

Mr. GINGREY changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. BEAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. BEAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Ms. BEAN:

Section 201(a), strike “25 percent” and insert “30 percent”.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 371, noes 55, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 321]

AYES—371

Abercrombie	Bono	Carson
Ackerman	Boozman	Castle
Aderholt	Bordallo	Castor
Alexander	Boren	Chabot
Allen	Boswell	Chandler
Altmire	Boucher	Christensen
Andrews	Boustany	Clarke
Arcuri	Boyd (FL)	Clay
Baca	Boyd (KS)	Cleaver
Baird	Braley (IA)	Clyburn
Baker	Brown (SC)	Coble
Baldwin	Brown, Corrine	Cohen
Barrow	Brown-Waite,	Cole (OK)
Bartlett (MD)	Ginny	Conyers
Bean	Buchanan	Cooper
Becerra	Burton (IN)	Costa
Berkley	Butterfield	Costello
Berman	Buyer	Courtney
Berry	Calvert	Cramer
Bilirakis	Camp (MI)	Crenshaw
Bishop (GA)	Capito	Crowley
Bishop (NY)	Capps	Cubin
Bishop (UT)	Capuano	Cuellar
Blackburn	Cardoza	Cummings
Blumenauer	Carnahan	Davis (AL)
Bonner	Carney	Davis (CA)



Davis (IL)	Kaptur	Putnam
Davis, David	Keller	Rahall
Davis, Jo Ann	Kennedy	Ramstad
Davis, Lincoln	Kildee	Rangel
Deal (GA)	Kilpatrick	Regula
DeFazio	Kind	Rehberg
DeGette	King (IA)	Reichert
Delahunt	King (NY)	Reyes
DeLauro	Kingston	Reynolds
Dent	Kirk	Rodriguez
Diaz-Balart, L.	Klein (FL)	Rogers (KY)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kline (MN)	Rogers (MI)
Dicks	Knollenberg	Rohrabacher
Dingell	Kucinich	Ros-Lehtinen
Doggett	Kuhl (NY)	Roskam
Donnelly	LaHood	Ross
Doyle	Lampson	Rothman
Drake	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
Duncan	Lantos	Ruppersberger
Edwards	Larsen (WA)	Rush
Ehlers	Latham	Ryan (OH)
Ellison	LaTourette	Salazar
Ellsworth	Lee	Sali
Emanuel	Levin	Sánchez, Linda
Emerson	Lewis (GA)	T.
English (PA)	Lewis (KY)	Sanchez, Loretta
Eshoo	Linder	Sarbanes
Etheridge	Lipinski	Saxton
Everett	LoBiondo	Schakowsky
Faleomavaega	Loeback	Schiff
Fallin	Lofgren, Zoe	Schmidt
Farr	Lowey	Schwartz
Ferguson	Lucas	Scott (GA)
Filner	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Forbes	Mahoney (FL)	Serrano
Fortenberry	Maloney (NY)	Sessions
Fortuño	Manzullo	Sestak
Frank (MA)	Markey	Shays
Frelinghuysen	Marshall	Shea-Porter
Galleghy	Matheson	Sherman
Garrett (NJ)	Matsui	Shimkus
Gerlach	McCarthy (CA)	Shuler
Giffords	McCarthy (NY)	Shuster
Gilchrest	McCaul (TX)	Simpson
Gillibrand	McCollum (MN)	Sires
Gillmor	McCotter	Skelton
Gingrey	McCrery	Slaughter
Gohmert	McDermott	Smith (NE)
Gonzalez	McGovern	Smith (NJ)
Goode	McHugh	Smith (TX)
Goodlatte	McIntyre	Smith (WA)
Gordon	McKeon	Snyder
Granger	McNerney	Solis
Graves	McNulty	Space
Green, Al	Meehan	Spratt
Green, Gene	Meeks (NY)	Stupak
Grijalva	Melancon	Sutton
Gutierrez	Mica	Tanner
Hall (NY)	Michaud	Tauscher
Hare	Miller (MI)	Taylor
Harman	Miller (NC)	Terry
Hastert	Miller, Gary	Thompson (CA)
Hastings (FL)	Miller, George	Thompson (MS)
Hastings (WA)	Mitchell	Tlahrt
Hayes	Mollohan	Tiberi
Heller	Moore (KS)	Tierney
Herseth Sandlin	Moore (WI)	Towns
Higgins	Moran (KS)	Turner
Hill	Moran (VA)	Udall (CO)
Hinchey	Murphy (CT)	Udall (NM)
Hinojosa	Murphy, Patrick	Upton
Hirono	Murphy, Tim	Van Hollen
Hobson	Murtha	Velázquez
Hodes	Musgrave	Visclosky
Holden	Nadler	Walden (OR)
Holt	Napolitano	Walsh (NY)
Honda	Neal (MA)	Walz (MN)
Hooley	Norton	Wamp
Hoyer	Oberstar	Wasserman
Hulshof	Obey	Schultz
Hunter	Oliver	Waters
Inglis (SC)	Ortiz	Watt
Inslee	Pallone	Weiner
Israel	Pascrell	Welch (VT)
Issa	Pastor	Weller
Jackson (IL)	Paul	Westmoreland
Jackson-Lee	Payne	Wexler
(TX)	Pearce	Whitfield
Jefferson	Perlmutter	Wicker
Jindal	Peterson (MN)	Wilson (NM)
Johnson (GA)	Peterson (PA)	Wilson (OH)
Johnson (IL)	Pickering	Wilson (SC)
Johnson, E. B.	Pitts	Wolf
Johnson, Sam	Platts	Woolsey
Jones (NC)	Pomeroy	Wu
Jones (OH)	Porter	Wynn
Jordan	Price (GA)	Yarmuth
Kagen	Price (NC)	Young (AK)
Kanjorski	Pryce (OH)	Young (FL)

## NOES—55

Akin	Dreier	Nunes
Bachmann	Feeney	Pence
Barrett (SC)	Flake	Petri
Barton (TX)	Fossella	Poe
Bigert	Fox	Radanovich
Bilbray	Franks (AZ)	Renzi
Blunt	Hall (TX)	Royce
Boehner	Hensarling	Ryan (WI)
Brady (TX)	Herger	Sensenbrenner
Burgess	Hoekstra	Shadegg
Campbell (CA)	Lamborn	Stark
Cannon	Lungren, Daniel	Stearns
Cantor	E.	Sullivan
Carter	Mack	Tancredo
Conaway	Marchant	Thornberry
Culberson	McHenry	Walberg
Davis (KY)	Miller (FL)	Waxman
Davis, Tom	Myrick	Weldon (FL)
Doolittle	Neugebauer	

## NOT VOTING—11

Bachus	Larson (CT)	Meek (FL)
Brady (PA)	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (AL)
Engel	McMorris	Souder
Fattah	Rodgers	Watson

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1134

Mr. GINGREY changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1873, the Small Business Fairness in Contracting Act. I commend my good friend from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) the Chairwoman of the Committee on Small Business for her leadership on this important legislation, and our colleague from Iowa (Mr. BRALEY), the bill's sponsor, for his work in crafting this legislation.

This legislation would amend the Small Business Act to, among other things, revise and add to Small Business Administration (SBA) requirements concerning contract bundling; increase the government-wide goal for participation by small businesses in federal procurement and service contracts; include overseas contracts in such goal; and require certain small businesses to annually recertify compliance with maximum small business size standards for eligibility for SBA-awarded contracts and subcontracts. These changes will make needed improvements to the contracting activities of federal departments and agencies with respect to America's small businesses.

This legislation also contains provisions that would direct the SBA Administrator to develop and maintain a database to assist small businesses in marketing to large corporations that have not achieved their small business goals; contact registered small businesses regarding the likelihood of federal contracting opportunities; prescribe regulations governing SBA review of subcontracting plans; ensure that whenever a small business loses a protest over its size, a notification is placed adjacent to the listing for that business in the Central Contractor Registry (CCR); and ensure a biannual review of the CCR to purge businesses no longer considered small businesses. The SBA Administrator, as a result of this legislation, will be more able to advocate on behalf of and support America's small businesses.

The federal marketplace today is worth upwards of \$380 billion. That is, the federal government is the world's largest buyer of goods and services. Unfortunately, year after year,

many federal agencies fall short of meeting mandated small business contracting goals. As a result, the numbers of and overall dollar amounts for contracts awarded to small businesses by departments and agencies of the federal government are not keeping pace with the overall growth of the federal marketplace. This legislation would go far toward addressing this disturbing trend.

Small businesses constitute nearly ninety percent of the businesses in my district. Supporting them is a top priority for me. Small businesses are the engine of America's economy, representing roughly ninety-nine percent of all employers, creating half of our gross domestic product, and creating up to eighty percent of the new jobs today.

Of particular importance to me, my constituents, and Guam's business community is Department of Defense small business contracting performance. The Department of Defense controls approximately seventy percent of the federal government's contracting dollars. But it controls the vast majority of the federal marketplace in my district, Guam. The amount of contracts issued by the Department of Defense for work on Guam will increase significantly in the years ahead as a result of the planned increase in the military presence on the island.

Ensuring that small businesses are prepared to and can successfully compete for contracts awarded by the Department of Defense is of particular importance to me. This is why I was very concerned last year when the Committee on Small Business issued its Scorecard VII Report. This report detailed federal government performance toward meeting small business contracting goals and found that approximately \$8 billion of Department of Defense contracting money reported as going to small businesses was, in fact, provided to large businesses. I was further concerned to learn from that report the Department of Defense from 2004 to 2005 has reduced its small business contract actions by sixty-five percent, despite the department having experienced a thirteen percent increase in total volume of contracts during the same period of time. I am particularly encouraged by the provisions contained in this bill that provide small businesses a better opportunity to compete for government contracts by making it harder for government agencies to bundle contracts into billion dollar super-contracts. This will put small businesses on a more level playing field with large corporations.

Nothing in this bill would change the fact that America's small business owners and operators must remain the hardworking innovators that they are and that they always have been in order for them to remain competitive and successful in the modern economy. This is particularly the case on Guam. Guam's small businesses will have to compete with bigger and better resourced companies that have significant capacity and that want to do business on Guam in support of the planned military build-up. The pace of business on Guam will increase significantly. Guam's small firms need to prepare today to be ready to succeed in a more competitive environment. To do this, I continue to encourage Guam's small business owners and operators to, among other things, identify what their business does well today; what it can do better tomorrow; and what it can do better than others over the course of the military build-up on Guam.

But this much is true: America's small businesses deserve fairer treatment in the federal marketplace than they currently receive. This is why I support H.R. 1873. It is a bipartisan measure that represents a vital step toward leveling the playing field for America's twenty-six million small businesses. In doing so, H.R. 1873 will help improve America's economy. Moreover, this legislation is critical toward improving the accountability in government contracting to America's small businesses. I urge my colleagues support for this bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY) having assumed the chair, Mr. CROWLEY, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1873) to reauthorize the programs and activities of the Small Business Administration relating to procurement, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 383, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. ENGLISH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. English of Pennsylvania moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 1873, to the Committee on Small Business, with instructions to report back the same forthwith with the following amendment:

In section 201, add at the end the following:

(c) ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED BUSINESSES.—For purposes of section 15(g) of that Act, the Administrator shall consider to be economically disadvantaged any small business concern that can demonstrate it is adversely affected by expiring tax incentives, and other modifications to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 which could result in small business tax increases, including but not limited to the 2006 expiration of the in-

creased exemption amount under the alternative minimum tax for taxpayers other than corporations, the 2010 expiration of section 179 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (regarding the ability of small businesses to deduct business expenses), the 2011 expiration of related capital gains, dividends, and death taxes, and the 2011 increase in all marginal income tax rates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the motion to commit is very simple and self-explanatory, but at the same time, it is also very timely. It comes at a time when there are legitimate and growing concerns about the pending change in tax policy in America and how it might affect the most dynamic sector of the American economy, and that is, after all, small business.

We know that literally 80 percent of the small businesses, 80 percent of the jobs that are created in the economy in America are created in small business, as has been defined under statute. We are anticipating that as this body moves forward and has passed a budget from the majority that implies the largest tax increase in American history, implies the phaseout of tax policies that have grown the economy since 2001, implies that in order to deal with the pending challenge of the AMT, that there is going to be a massive increase in personal rates, particularly at the high end, that affects subchapter S small businesses.

We think that it is very important now to require the SBA administrator, under this motion, to consider small businesses as economically disadvantaged if they demonstrate an adverse impact due to the expiration of this tax relief. After all, who in this body could possibly be against accounting for and recognizing through an SBA designation the impact on such a vital portion of our economy before haphazardly increasing taxes through what we anticipate is going to be the father of all tax increases. This is, I think, a huge challenge for us, and it is a challenge which we should adjust this program to acknowledge.

I am concerned that if we see a change in our tax policies on this scale, that it is going to have a huge impact on small businesses in districts like mine. For example, the potential change in tax policy could dramatically downsize the section 179 small business expensing provision. This allows small businesses to immediately expense critical capital investment, allowing them to remain competitive in the global economy, allowing them to put money back into their hands, back into their production line, back into the hands of small business, an immediate write-off that demonstrably creates jobs right here in America.

Without the help of section 179, many of our small businesses are at an enormous competitive disadvantage. Section 179 was once described to me by an economist as one of the most

progrowth features currently in the Tax Code. The notion that we would allow it to lapse to its previous level is particularly troubling and I think requires us to prepare the SBA for the impact that these tax policy changes could have.

All this motion to recommit is seeking to do is to give small businesses a tool to enhance their success in the marketplace, despite the potential for being hammered by a Brobdingnagian set of tax increases required by the budget that we are going to be facing.

By offering this motion to recommit, we feel that the underlying bill ought to also lay before Congress a way to determine whether or not the tax increases that will be proposed by this budget will move small business backwards and also provide for a tool, but in a very small way, to counteract that. Every Member of this body should join me in supporting this motion to recommit if they care about the future ability of small businesses in their districts to grow, to survive, to compete and add new jobs.

I urge the adoption of this motion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I would just like to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I am a little confused, because if he cares so much about extending section 179, where was he last week when we voted to override the veto of the President where section 179 was part of it?

Further, the gentleman from Pennsylvania seems to me that he is going to vote against his own motion.

□ 1145

Let me just say that this bill is not about taxes. What I can tell you that I am glad to say, that this new Congress is committed to meeting the needs of the entrepreneurs. This Congress just sent a bill to the President cutting taxes for small businesses. While the President passed a bill for tax breaks for large companies, the President just vetoed the one that helped small businesses, like section 179; not only extending section 179, but expanding section 179. Republicans passed \$2 trillion in tax cuts, yet small business priorities were never taken care of.

This motion is not about small businesses and taxes. Entrepreneurs have seen the record on that issue from Republicans. It is about ensuring small businesses are not shut out of the Federal contracts. I ask a "no" vote on this motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 209, noes 216, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 322]

## AYES—209

Aderholt	Gallegly	Myrick
Akin	Garrett (NJ)	Neugebauer
Alexander	Gerlach	Nunes
Bachmann	Giffords	Paul
Baker	Gilchrest	Pearce
Barrett (SC)	Gillmor	Pence
Bartlett (MD)	Gingrey	Peterson (PA)
Barton (TX)	Gohmert	Petri
Biggert	Goode	Pickering
Bilbray	Goodlatte	Pitts
Bilirakis	Granger	Platts
Bishop (UT)	Graves	Poe
Blackburn	Hall (TX)	Porter
Blunt	Hastert	Price (GA)
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)
Bonner	Hayes	Putnam
Bono	Heller	Radanovich
Boozman	Hensarling	Ramstad
Boustany	Herger	Regula
Brady (TX)	Hill	Rehberg
Brown (SC)	Hobson	Reichert
Brown-Waite,	Hoekstra	Renzi
Ginny	Hulshof	Reynolds
Buchanan	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Burgess	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (KY)
Burton (IN)	Issa	Rogers (MI)
Buyer	Jindal	Rohrabacher
Calvert	Johnson (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Camp (MI)	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Campbell (CA)	Jones (NC)	Royce
Cannon	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Cantor	Keller	Sali
Capito	King (IA)	Saxton
Carney	King (NY)	Schmidt
Carter	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Castle	Kirk	Sessions
Chabot	Klein (FL)	Shadeeg
Coble	Kline (MN)	Shays
Cole (OK)	Knollenberg	Shimkus
Conaway	Kuhl (NY)	Shuster
Crenshaw	LaHood	Simpson
Cubin	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Cuellar	Lampson	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	Latham	Smith (TX)
Davis (KY)	LaTourette	Space
Davis, David	Lewis (CA)	Stearns
Davis, Jo Ann	Lewis (KY)	Sullivan
Davis, Tom	Linder	Tancredo
Deal (GA)	LoBiondo	Taylor
Dent	Lucas	Terry
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lungren, Daniel	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, M.	E.	Tiahrt
Donnelly	Mack	Tiberi
Doolittle	Manzullo	Turner
Drake	Marchant	Upton
Dreier	McCarthy (CA)	Walberg
Duncan	McCaul (TX)	Walden (OR)
Ehlers	McCotter	Walsh (NY)
Emerson	McCrery	Wamp
English (PA)	McHenry	Weldon (FL)
Everett	McHugh	Weller
Fallin	McIntyre	Westmoreland
Feeney	McKeon	Whitfield
Ferguson	Mica	Wicker
Flake	Miller (FL)	Wilson (NM)
Forbes	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry	Miller, Gary	Wolf
Fossella	Mitchell	Young (AK)
Fox	Moran (KS)	Young (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Murphy, Tim	
Frelinghuysen	Musgrave	

## NOES—216

Abercrombie	Altmire	Baca
Ackerman	Andrews	Baird
Allen	Arcuri	Baldwin

Barrow	Higgins	Ortiz
Bean	Hinche	Pallone
Becerra	Hinojosa	Pascarell
Berkley	Hirono	Pastor
Berman	Hodes	Payne
Berry	Holden	Pelosi
Bishop (GA)	Holt	Perlmutter
Bishop (NY)	Honda	Peterson (MN)
Blumenauer	Hooley	Pomeroy
Boren	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Boswell	Inslee	Rahall
Boucher	Israel	Rangel
Boyd (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Reyes
Boyd (KS)	Jackson-Lee	Rodriguez
Braley (IA)	(TX)	Ross
Brown, Corrine	Jefferson	Rothman
Butterfield	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Capuano	Jones (OH)	Rush
Cardoza	Kagen	Ryan (OH)
Carnahan	Kanjorski	Salazar
Carson	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Castor	Kennedy	T.
Chandler	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke	Kilpatrick	Sarbanes
Clay	Kind	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kucinich	Schiff
Clyburn	Langevin	Schwartz
Cohen	Lantos	Scott (GA)
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Lee	Serrano
Costa	Levin	Sestak
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Shea-Porter
Courtney	Lipinski	Sherman
Cramer	Loeb sack	Shuler
Crowley	Lofgren, Zoe	Sires
Cummings	Lowey	Skelton
Davis (AL)	Lynch	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Mahoney (FL)	Smith (WA)
Davis (IL)	Maloney (NY)	Snyder
Davis, Lincoln	Markley	Solis
DeFazio	Marshall	Spratt
DeGette	Matheson	Stark
Delahunt	Matsui	Stupak
DeLauro	McCarthy (NY)	Sutton
Dicks	McCollum (MN)	Tanner
Dingell	McDermott	Tauscher
Doggett	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Doyle	McNerney	Thompson (MS)
Edwards	McNulty	Tierney
Ellison	Meehan	Towns
Ellsworth	Meek (FL)	Udall (CO)
Emanuel	Meeks (NY)	Udall (NM)
Eshoo	Melancon	Van Hollen
Etheridge	Michaud	Velázquez
Farr	Miller (NC)	Visclosky
Filner	Miller, George	Walz (MN)
Frank (MA)	Mollohan	Wasserman
Gillibrand	Moore (KS)	Schultz
Gonzalez	Moore (WI)	Waters
Gordon	Moran (VA)	Watt
Green, Al	Murphy (CT)	Waxman
Green, Gene	Murphy, Patrick	Weiner
Grijalva	Murtha	Welch (VT)
Gutierrez	Nader	Wexler
Hall (NY)	Napolitano	Wilson (OH)
Hare	Neal (MA)	Woolsey
Harman	Oberstar	Wu
Hastings (FL)	Obey	Wynn
Herseth Sandlin	Oliver	Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—8

Bachus	Larson (CT)	Watson
Brady (PA)	McMorris	
Engel	Rodgers	
Fattah	Souder	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining to vote.

□ 1205

Messrs. SALAZAR, SKELTON, COHEN and ALTMIRE changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 409, noes 13, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 323]

## AYES—409

Abercrombie	Cuellar	Hirono
Ackerman	Culberson	Hobson
Aderholt	Cummings	Hodes
Akin	Davis (AL)	Hoekstra
Alexander	Davis (CA)	Holden
Allen	Davis (IL)	Holt
Altmire	Davis (KY)	Honda
Andrews	Davis, David	Hooley
Arcuri	Davis, Jo Ann	Hoyer
Baca	Davis, Lincoln	Hulshof
Bachmann	Davis, Tom	Hunter
Baird	Deal (GA)	Inglis (SC)
Baker	DeFazio	Inlee
Baldwin	DeGette	Israel
Barrett (SC)	Delahunt	Issa
Barrow	DeLauro	Jackson (IL)
Bartlett (MD)	Dent	Jackson-Lee
Barton (TX)	Diaz-Balart, L.	(TX)
Bean	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jefferson
Becerra	Dicks	Jindal
Berkley	Dingell	Johnson (GA)
Berman	Doggett	Johnson (IL)
Berry	Donnelly	Johnson, E. B.
Biggert	Doolittle	Johnson, Sam
Bilbray	Doyle	Jones (NC)
Bilirakis	Drake	Jones (OH)
Bishop (GA)	Dreier	Jordan
Bishop (NY)	Duncan	Kagen
Bishop (UT)	Edwards	Kanjorski
Blackburn	Ehlers	Kaptur
Blumenauer	Ellison	Keller
Blunt	Ellsworth	Kennedy
Boehner	Emanuel	Kildee
Bonner	Emerson	Kilpatrick
Bono	English (PA)	Kind
Boozman	Eshoo	King (IA)
Boren	Etheridge	King (NY)
Boswell	Everett	Kingston
Boucher	Fallin	Kirk
Boustany	Farr	Klein (FL)
Boyd (FL)	Feeney	Kline (MN)
Boyda (KS)	Ferguson	Knollenberg
Brady (TX)	Filner	Kucinich
Braley (IA)	Forbes	Kuhl (NY)
Brown (SC)	Fortenberry	LaHood
Brown-Waite,	Fossella	Lampson
Ginny	Fox	Langevin
Buchanan	Frank (MA)	Lantos
Burgess	Franks (AZ)	Larsen (WA)
Burton (IN)	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Butterfield	Gallegly	LaTourette
Buyer	Garrett (NJ)	Lee
Calvert	Gerlach	Levin
Camp (MI)	Giffords	Lewis (CA)
Cannon	Gilchrest	Lewis (GA)
Cantor	Gillibrand	Lewis (KY)
Capito	Gillmor	Linder
Capps	Gingrey	Lipinski
Capuano	Gohmert	LoBiondo
Carnahan	Gonzalez	Loeb sack
Carney	Goode	Lofgren, Zoe
Carson	Goodlatte	Lowey
Carter	Gordon	Lucas
Castle	Granger	Lynch
Castor	Graves	Mack
Chabot	Green, Al	Mahoney (FL)
Chandler	Green, Gene	Maloney (NY)
Clarke	Grijalva	Manzullo
Clay	Gutierrez	Marchant
Cleaver	Hall (NY)	Markley
Clyburn	Hall (TX)	Marshall
Coble	Hare	Matheson
Cohen	Harman	Matsui
Cole (OK)	Hastert	McCarthy (CA)
Conaway	Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (NY)
Conyers	Hastings (WA)	McCauley (TX)
Cooper	Hayes	McCotter
Costa	Heller	McCrery
Costello	Herger	McDermott
Courtney	Herseth Sandlin	McGovern
Cramer	Higgins	McHugh
Crenshaw	Hill	McIntyre
Crowley	Hinche	McKeon
Cubin	Hinojosa	McNerney

McNulty	Rahall	Space
Meehan	Ramstad	Spratt
Meek (FL)	Rangel	Stark
Meeks (NY)	Regula	Stearns
Melancon	Rehberg	Stupak
Mica	Reichert	Sullivan
Michaud	Renzi	Sutton
Miller (FL)	Reyes	Tancredo
Miller (MI)	Reynolds	Tanner
Miller (NC)	Rodriguez	Tauscher
Miller, Gary	Rogers (AL)	Taylor
Mitchell	Rogers (KY)	Terry
Mollohan	Rogers (MI)	Thompson (CA)
Moore (KS)	Rohrabacher	Thompson (MS)
Moore (WI)	Ros-Lehtinen	Thornberry
Moran (KS)	Roskam	Tiahrt
Moran (VA)	Ross	Tiberi
Murphy (CT)	Rothman	Tierney
Murphy, Patrick	Roybal-Allard	Towns
Murphy, Tim	Ruppersberger	Turner
Murtha	Rush	Udall (CO)
Musgrave	Ryan (OH)	Udall (NM)
Myrick	Ryan (WI)	Upton
Nadler	Salazar	Van Hollen
Napolitano	Sánchez, Linda	Velázquez
Neal (MA)	T.	Visclosky
Neugebauer	Sanchez, Loretta	Walberg
Nunes	Sarbanes	Walden (OR)
Oberstar	Saxton	Walsh (NY)
Obey	Schakowsky	Walz (MN)
Olver	Schiff	Wamp
Ortiz	Schmidt	Wasserman
Pallone	Schwartz	Schultz
Pascarell	Scott (GA)	Waters
Pastor	Scott (VA)	Watt
Paul	Serrano	Waxman
Payne	Sessions	Weiner
Pearce	Sestak	Welch (VT)
Pence	Shays	Weldon (FL)
Perlmutter	Shea-Porter	Weller
Peterson (MN)	Sherman	Westmoreland
Peterson (PA)	Shinkus	Wexler
Petri	Shuler	Wicker
Pickering	Shuster	Wilson (NM)
Pitts	Simpson	Wilson (OH)
Platts	Sires	Wilson (SC)
Poe	Skelton	Wolf
Pomeroy	Slaughter	Woolsey
Porter	Smith (NE)	Wu
Price (GA)	Smith (NJ)	Wynn
Price (NC)	Smith (TX)	Yarmuth
Pryce (OH)	Smith (WA)	Young (AK)
Putnam	Snyder	Young (FL)
Radanovich	Solis	

## NOES—13

Campbell (CA)	Lungren, Daniel	Royce
Flake	E.	Sali
Hensarling	McCollum (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Lamborn	McHenry	Shadegg
	Miller, George	Whitfield

## NOT VOTING—10

Bachus	Engel	McMorris
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Rodgers
Brown, Corrine	Larson (CT)	Souder
Cardoza		Watson

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining to vote.

□ 1215

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 323, I inserted by vote card but was not recorded. My intention was to vote “yes.” Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2237, PROVIDING FOR RE-DEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES AND DEFENSE CONTRACTORS FROM IRAQ; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2206, U.S. TROOP READINESS, VETERANS' CARE, KATRINA RECOVERY, AND IRAQ ACCOUNTABILITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2207, AGRICULTURAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND WESTERN STATES EMERGENCY UNFINISHED BUSINESS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 387 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 387

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2237) to provide for the redeployment of United States Armed Forces and defense contractors from Iraq. All points of order against the bill and against its consideration are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2206) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2207) making supplemental appropriations for agricultural and other emergency assistance for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 4. (a) In the engrossment of H.R. 2206, the Clerk shall—

(1) await the disposition of H.R. 2237 and H.R. 2207;

(2) add the respective texts of H.R. 2237 and H.R. 2207, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 2206;

(3) conform the title of H.R. 2206 to reflect the addition of H.R. 2237 and H.R. 2207, as passed by the House, to the engrossment;

(4) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and

(5) conform cross-references and provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

(b) Upon the addition of H.R. 2237 and H.R. 2207, as passed by the House, to the engrossment of H.R. 2206, H.R. 2237 and H.R. 2207 shall be laid on the table.

SEC. 5. During consideration of H.R. 2237, H.R. 2206, or H.R. 2207 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of any such bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

I yield myself such time as I may consume and ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 387.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 387 provides for consideration of three bills, including the supplemental appropriations for the Iraq war.

It is striking to realize that for 4 years the war in Iraq has been funded by supplemental appropriations measures. From the beginning the White House has refused to plan ahead. Instead it has counted on Congress to accept its demands and pass one supplemental bill and then another time and time again, with no end in sight and no accountability required in return.

The American people have rejected a House that blindly accepts the administration's predictions about Iraq, all the while ceding its role in deciding matters of war and peace, the most solemn responsibility given to the Congress.

My fellow Democrats and I promised a new way forward. And so the first funding bill that we delivered to the President reconciled our party's conscience with the brutal realities the war presented to us, realities that we, unlike some in the administration, are willing to acknowledge.

We sought then, as we do now, to end this war but to do so responsibly, without adding to the suffering the Iraqi people and our soldiers have already experienced.

Our first bill provided the President with all of the funding he requested but attached conditions to it. We asked for the President to stand before the Nation and justify the war. We asked him to show how it was meeting the objectives that he himself had set out: the

promotion of political progress in the country and the increase of internal security in Iraq, all of which is his responsibility. And we said the war would not go on forever, that it must have an end, not an irresponsible end but an end.

The President rejected our offer out of hand. He told us that while he would never compromise, we had to.

Mr. Speaker, stubbornness is not the same as strength. Being obstinate is not equivalent to having conviction. This President famously told the world that he would refuse to alter his policy in Iraq even if, as he put it, nobody stood by him except his wife and his dog.

But he is not making decisions that impact only himself. The weight of his decisions are being borne by the American people and the people of Iraq. His decisions are costing American lives and they are costing Iraqi lives. They are overstressing our military. They are undermining the national security of this Nation. And they are not improving the wretched conditions of the Iraqis the war is theoretically helping.

The President must not be allowed to ignore everyone: the majority of the generals, the majority of the House, the majority of the Senate, the majority of the Nation, and the overwhelming majority of the world. He must not be allowed to ignore everyone when it is they who are bearing the burden of his war and suffering the consequences of his administration's mistakes. He must understand that his opinion, as sincere as it may be, is not the only one that matters. He must yield.

The bill we are considering today will, once again, give him the chance to acknowledge the demands of the citizens of this country. They are demanding a change of direction in Iraq, and this bill delivers it.

This legislation will fund military operations in Iraq between now and July. By then the President's surge plan will be in full effect, and its impact, either positive or negative, will be obvious. The President will report to Congress on the state of political and military progress in Iraq, and then we will vote on whether or not to provide the remaining funds that have been requested. Our degree of financial support at that point will be based not on endless promises or rosy scenarios, but on concrete reality on the ground in Iraq. Accountability is being introduced into the conduct of this war.

Mr. Speaker, let me also add that during the last debate on this supplemental, the President and his supporters told us the measure was "unclean," that it contained spending unrelated to the war effort.

That spending, Mr. Speaker, was for critical projects the last Congress failed to fund by not passing any budget at all for the year 2007, which included funding for veterans care, recovery from Hurricane Katrina, health insurance for children, home heating oil

for low-income families, and much more. In other words, there is nothing dirty about it. My fellow Democrats and I refuse to abandon it. We are going to fund these vital and important projects because people are counting on them. What is more, we campaigned on increasing the minimum wage, and this supplemental spending legislation will do that as well. And I hope we don't hear anything more about so-called "unrelated spending."

Mr. Speaker, it is long past time for this body to abandon the destructive rhetoric that has labeled this plan a form of "surrender." It is time to stop branding the Democrats, and a growing number of Republicans, who seek to end this brutal conflict as "defeatists."

We want our country to be secure. We want our military to be sound. We want the Iraqi people to be able to live with dignity. But we see that this war fought in this way is undermining all of those goals. And we are not alone. We speak for a clear and vocal majority of the American people, and we represent their wishes. For the sake of our citizens, for our soldiers, and the people of Iraq, we will be heard.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise to express my appreciation to my very good friend from Rochester, the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Rules (Ms. SLAUGHTER), for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I have to say that this is somewhat unusual for me. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule, but I rise in even stronger opposition to the underlying legislation.

Here we go again, Mr. Speaker. These bills bring us to round three, round three of the Democratic leadership's Iraq charade.

First they brought up a bill that they knew the President would veto. Then they called for a veto override that they knew would fail. And today we are once again considering the same defeatist policy that failed in the first two rounds plus, plus, Mr. Speaker, a call for redeployment, basically withdrawal, within 90 days, to begin withdrawal within 90 days.

Mr. Speaker, they may think that they made progress, but in truth we have, in fact, gone backwards. Kicking the pullout vote a few months down the road is not a solution.

Mr. Speaker, the closing remarks that were just offered by the distinguished Chair of the Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER, I think were right on target in describing the exact goal that we have here. We want to make sure that the American people are secure. We want to make sure that our troops can be successful. We want to make sure that our troops come home. And we want to make sure that the Iraqi people can live with dignity. The one thing that I will add with that statement that Ms. SLAUGHTER just made, Mr. Speaker, is that not only simply

live with dignity but with the kind of self-determination that led to a 70 percent voter turnout in Iraq. So obviously we share the exact same goal that Ms. SLAUGHTER just outlined.

But I am very, very troubled with the plans that we have before us. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, withdrawal that would begin in 90 days would undermine every single one of those goals to which Ms. SLAUGHTER just referred. And this time, Mr. Speaker, it is not just the President's opposition that stands in their way of what it is that they are trying to do. Their own colleagues in the Senate have said that the House Democratic leadership's approach won't work on their side of the Capitol.

□ 1230

Senate Majority Leader REID has criticized their punting strategy and acknowledged he has serious doubts that the House plan could actually get through the Senate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this policy of defeat couldn't prevail in April. It won't prevail in May. So it would appear the idea is to wait and hope for the best in July.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the war in Iraq is not a game. Funding our troops who are in harm's way is not a game. These votes may make my friends on the other side of the aisle feel good, but they aren't doing anything to get our troops what they need to protect themselves and to fight effectively against terrorists around the world. Mr. Speaker, that's what matters here.

Again, going back to the words of the very distinguished Chair of the Committee on Rules, Ms. SLAUGHTER, we want to make sure that we are secure at home. The way to do that is to ensure that the troops have what they need.

Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation to have a serious, substantive debate to supply our troops with the funds they need to do their job and to demonstrate to the American people that we are doing what is necessary to win in Iraq and to bring our troops home. But rather than fulfilling our duties as responsible legislators, Democratic leadership has simply scheduled one more empty political vote under yet another totally closed process. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Democrats go so far as to have three closed rules, two of them on appropriations bills. Now, we will consider four appropriations bills this year, and all of them, Mr. Speaker, will have been under a completely closed process. And we all know, under both Democrats and Republicans, the tradition is that when it comes to wartime supplementals, they be considered under an open amendment process, but that's been thrown out the door.

This is a far cry, Mr. Speaker, from the open and fair Congress that was promised to the American people. Worse yet, buried in the appropriations bill is yet another totally closed rule, completely and prospectively shutting out Republicans 2 months from now.

And they even go so far as to totally deny us a motion to recommit, something that we never did in the 12 years that we were in the majority. And those were tame restrictions when compared to what they tried to do to the Senate.

It has been said by my very good friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for whom I have the highest regard, I served with him for many years on the Rules Committee. I had the privilege for the past 8 years of chairing the Rules Committee, and during that period of time, Mr. McGovern would regularly say that the Rules Committee is the place where democracy goes to die. Mr. Speaker, I think that it is only fitting that it is the rule which provides for this bill, for his bill, that we will use to pronounce the time of death. And while this tactic fails to achieve a legislative success here at home, it is already producing disastrous results in Iraq.

Ryan Crocker, the very highly regarded new ambassador to Iraq, I've heard a number of leading Democrats, a number of leading outspoken foes of what it is that we are doing in Iraq speak very highly of Ryan Crocker. Ambassador Crocker said last week in an interview with Morton Kondracke of *The Roll Call*, that the Iraqis are watching the Democratic leadership's political games play out in Congress. They hear the calls to abandon our mission, and it is taking away any will to negotiate among political factions and achieve an effective government capable of bringing about a political solution to the crisis.

Mr. Speaker, as Kondracke puts it in his piece, and I quote, "What is going on in Congress is hurting Crocker's ability to get the sides in Iraq to make agreements with one another." He goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, "It hardens the sectarian divisions. They think we are going to leave, and instead of reaching across lines and making agreements with the adversary, they are getting ready to go to the mat."

Now, that is what Mr. Kondracke writes following his discussion with Ambassador Crocker, and it's very troubling.

What we do here and say here, Mr. Speaker, has consequences. And the report back from the new Ambassador to Iraq is that those consequences are not good. Those who would declare this war lost before the new strategy of, again, the very highly regarded General David Petraeus, who enjoyed unanimous support of the United States Senate, that means Democrats and Republicans on a recorded vote provided unanimous support confirming General David Petraeus. We are now basically, with what we are trying to do here with this effort, not even giving his new strategy a chance to succeed, and I believe that it is a huge mistake.

Now, Mr. Speaker, like everyone in this institution and people around this country, I read the newspapers, and I watch the news. I watch the pictures

on television. And I know that the terrible images of violence that are broadcast every day permeate. And as we see those horrible pictures, I don't blame the American people for becoming extremely discouraged by what is being reported out of Iraq. And I will say that I am horrified by the pictures and the things that we see coming out of Iraq. But there is real and significant progress that is being achieved by our military.

Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune editorialized just yesterday on one of the great success stories, that success story being the al Anbar province, which is the large province just to the west of Baghdad. Its capital city, Ramadi, was once described by the *New York Times* as the most dangerous city in Iraq and potentially the most dangerous city on the face of the earth. Today, Mr. Speaker, this former outpost for the insurgency is not only a secure city, it is a model for Sunni, Shia and American cooperation in the fight against the organization that was responsible for what happened on September 11, 2001, that being al Qaeda.

Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune editorial said, "al Qaeda's terrorists in Iraq now face a new enemy, Sunni tribesmen in the al Anbar province." Their editorial goes on, and I quote, "These tribal leaders in the heart of the insurgency are now backing coalition and Iraqi forces against the terrorists." "You want good news from Iraq," the Chicago Tribune editorial goes on to say, "there it is, flashing in neon."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this editorial goes on to quote the *New York Times* report saying, "The progress has inspired an optimism in the American command that among some officials borders on giddiness." "There are some people who would say we have won the war out here," one Marine officer said. I am simply quoting, I would say to my friend, the chair of the Rules Committee, not something that a Republican said, but the editorial that appeared just yesterday. I would encourage all of our Members to look at that editorial in the Chicago Tribune.

Now, Mr. Speaker, through the Joint Services stations that have been established, local Sunni police, Shia Army officers and U.S. military have worked hand in hand to take back the city and the province and drive al Qaeda out. With the full support and cooperation of the local Sunni leaders, the Shia Army has earned the confidence of the local population. Through their alliance, they are achieving our objective for the entire country, peace sustained by the Iraqis themselves through national unity.

Mr. Speaker, General Petraeus came here, as we all know, just 2 weeks ago to provide Members of the House of Representatives with a classified briefing on Iraq. Unfortunately, the Speaker of the House, Ms. PELOSI, was unable to attend that briefing, but for those of us who were there, we were given a realistic picture from General Petraeus

of what was taking place. He did not, and I don't know all of the Members who were there, Mr. Speaker, but I will say, General Petraeus did not sugarcoat the tremendous challenges that lie ahead in this war in Iraq. But, Mr. Speaker, he also described tremendous successes, such as this great success that I just reported on in Ramadi, what was one of the most dangerous cities on the face of the Earth and has now been stabilized in the al Anbar province.

General Petraeus described the Sunni Arabs who have turned against al Qaeda and have joined the Iraqi Security Forces. Our American and Iraqi forces have succeeded in detaining a number of key network leaders, getting critical intelligence on how various elements of al Qaeda operate in Iraq, taking apart a car bomb network that killed 650 citizens in Baghdad and destroying several significant car bomb factories. These are the kinds of joint efforts that are taking place at this very moment in Iraq, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, General Petraeus has spoken publicly about these successes, about the reduction in sectarian murders in Baghdad by two-thirds so far this year, about the tripling of seizures of weapons caches this year, about the revival of markets and the return of displaced families to neighborhoods and cities that were previously totally uninhabitable because of violence. Mr. Speaker, these success stories are not meant to paint a rosy picture of Iraq. And I will say that again, Mr. Speaker. I'm not attempting to sugarcoat the situation in Iraq. I'm not attempting to paint a rosy picture of what is taking place in Iraq. I know how horrendous and what a difficult situation this is.

We all know the enormous challenges that our military still faces there and will continue to face for some time to come, not just to be solved by September; it will extend longer than that, we all know that. The other night I was with Ambassador John Negroponte who reminded me of the public statement that he made just as he left his ambassadorial post in Baghdad; he said it would be at least 5 years. So we all know that this battle and this struggle is going to continue.

But what these successes do demonstrate very, very clearly is that we have not lost this war. They demonstrate that our men and women, when they have the necessary resources, can achieve victory. We must give General Petraeus adequate time and adequate resources to build upon these successes and make his new strategy work. Setting a day for defeat, whether it is today, next week or at the end of July or September is simply not an acceptable policy. Rationing funding for our troops is not an acceptable policy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I offered two amendments yesterday in the Rules Committee that would have stricken two of the most egregious elements of



this legislation. First, I proposed to remove the July cutoff date for the troops' funding. Our generals in the field have said that this limitation ties their hands and keeps them from doing even their near-term planning, which is absolutely essential if the successes that we have seen are going to continue. Wars aren't won in 2-month increments, and military victories aren't achieved by congressional decree.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my second amendment would eliminate the requirement that the President make his reports to Congress on the Internet. Even in its unclassified form, this highly sensitive information would provide information to our enemies and the enemies of the Iraqi people. It would provide them with their blueprint for victory. The notion of providing this report from the President to the Congress, not in any kind of confidential way but on the Internet, is absolutely outrageous. There is no justifiable reason for us to give the people who are wanting to kill us and are responsible for the violence in Iraq this kind of information.

Now, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, neither of the amendments that I offered was made in order. They would have provided an opportunity to consider a troop funding bill that would actually be enacted and would actually fund the troops rather than simply staging one more meaningless vote allowing Members to posture.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand very well, having been in the majority for a while, I understand that the Democratic leadership is in a very tough spot. They want to be able to say that they are funding the troops. At the same time, they have to accommodate their Members who want to get out yesterday. They want to get out immediately, regardless of the consequences. So their political situation is to schedule vote after meaningless vote. They get their weekly opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to say, "I support the troops," out of one side of their mouth, and "Let's retreat" and get out immediately out of the other side of their mouth.

□ 1245

But, Mr. Speaker, our troops and the American people deserve more than political gimmicks. We must stop playing dangerous games with the lives of the American people, our men and women in uniform, and the Iraqi people who have been struggling for freedom. We must get our troops the funding that they need and give our military commanders the means to win and to do what we all want, Mr. Speaker, to bring our troops home.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just respond to my colleague from California saying that we can't

win the war on 2-month funding intervals. I would submit we have now been at this Iraq war longer than it took us to win World War II when we were fighting both Japan and Germany, and still we are no closer, and, I would submit, further from what they define as "victory."

I, like so many Americans, have tried to be patient with this administration in extricating us from the difficulties we find ourselves in in Iraq. They first told us there were weapons of mass destruction. None were found, yet we were still patient. Then they told us we were there to remove a tyrant. We removed Saddam Hussein, yet we are still there, and we continue to be patient. They told us we were there to fight terrorism, and we have been fighting terrorism, and we still remain patient.

Now they tell us that we are there to make our families safer. Well, I don't feel that my family is any safer as a result of our being in Iraq. And like the American people, I am losing patience with the hollow promises that this administration has made about getting us out of Iraq.

I rise today in support of this rule because I think that it is time that we change the course, we change the direction. How many strategies is this administration going to adopt before they arrive at success?

Last night in the Rules Committee I got to thinking as we were discussing this rule about my own children, about my family, and I thought about how would my children look at me later in life, how would my grandchildren look at me later on, in terms of how we tried to stop this conflict in Iraq. Then I thought about a situation that I talked about a lot during my campaign.

During my campaign, when I was trying to decide whether or not I would run, my son and my daughter, who are both teenagers, were not supportive of that. One day my son said to me, Dad, what is it that a Congressman does? I started telling my son what a Congressman does.

He said, Dad, are you saying that if you get to Congress, you will be able to stop the war in Iraq?

I said, Not alone, but certainly with the other Members of Congress.

He said then, I really think that you should run for Congress, because the war in Iraq is a bad thing and too many people are dying.

My son, then 15 years old, got it. He understood what it was about. He understood that we are in Iraq for the wrong reason. He understood that it was time to change the course and change the direction.

That is why I rise today. I rise because I support the rule that will get us out of Iraq, but, more importantly, because my children know that it is the right thing to do.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3½ minutes to the gen-

tlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON), a member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the honorable chairwoman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, our troops are brave and capable. They have fought heroically. But, Mr. Speaker, today we have an opportunity to tell our President that he can no longer ignore the American people, this Congress or the reality of the situation we face in Iraq.

We have the responsibility to provide oversight, to ensure that our brave and honorable troops are provided a mission based on a realistic assessment and an achievable goal before we ask them to risk life and limb to implement it. We must end the strain that we have put on our brave military men and women and their families, and we must act today.

Mr. Speaker, we know we must get our troops out of the crossfire and the violence of the raging civil war in Iraq. We know what must be done for our soldiers in Iraq to ensure the protection of them and our families here at home. Our military and our National Guard are stretched thin. We must rebuild and re-equip both. Our National Guard in Ohio is training and working on gear that is obsolete. So not only are our military men and women at risk in Iraq; we have our homeland exposed to national emergencies and other threats that we may face. But our President has refused to acknowledge the reality of the situation that we face as a Nation, and I and many other Members of this Congress will not allow the status quo to continue.

For this reason, I cosponsored and will cast a powerful "yes" vote in support of H.R. 2237. This bill, authored by Mr. MCGOVERN, whom I respect tremendously for his courage and leadership, is responsible and will ensure the safe redeployment of our troops from Iraq. Our bill calls for the redeployment of our troops and allows Congress to take back from the President the reckless decisionmaking that we have seen.

Our bill also very importantly ensures a number of things: it protects the ability of our military to go after al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations in Iraq; it provides for the protection of diplomatic and other related U.S. personnel in Iraq; and, finally, it will truly shift our role in Iraq to training and equipping the Iraqi security forces.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to end this war; and, unfortunately, the failed policies of this administration and lack of oversight from past Congresses have left us with few options. 3,372 of our troops, including 157 brave military men and women from Ohio, have died in this war. It is time we did the responsible thing for our heroic soldiers, for their families and for our Nation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, we must end this war. On November 7, when the American people spoke in the last election, from Washington State to Florida, from Vermont to California, they made a very clear decision that they want to bring our troops home. Their challenge to us is to implement that policy.

Americans want a new direction in Iraq. The citizens of America know that the time has come to change direction, to bring our troops home with their heads held high in honor of a job well done.

Mr. Speaker, many of our finest, most highly decorated members of the military, now retired, can say publicly what in the past they could only say privately. It is this: Iraq is engaged in a civil war. It is not the proper job of our men and women in uniform to referee an Iraqi civil war.

The citizens of our country also recognize the obvious: if the Iraqi leadership is unwilling to help itself, how can we expect the American people and the American military to do that job for them? Iraqi leaders will not spend \$10 billion in funds available to improve electricity and water, yet expect Americans to spend our taxpayer dollars to do that.

Commonsense citizens in our country are asking an obvious question: If the Iraqi Parliament has work to do, why is it taking a 2-month vacation this summer, a vacation, when they haven't reached agreement on oil sharing, when they haven't allowed former Baathists, low level with no blood on their hands, to resume a place in that society, when they won't crack down on sectarian violence, and, Mr. Speaker, when they interfere with the efforts of the American military when they attempt to do so?

Mr. Speaker, there is a very clear recognition on the part of the American people, and it is this: our men and women in uniform have done their job. They toppled Saddam, they reported back that there were no weapons of mass destruction, and they did provide stability in Iraq so that they could have three elections.

What we face now is a White House that has dug its heels in and a President who refuses to change and adjust and provide leadership to the facts as they exist. Those facts: Iraq is engaged in a civil war, something the White House denies. Those facts: it is the job of the Iraqi political leadership and the people of Iraq to create a civil society. It is not the job of the military to do nation-building.

The legislation we have is going to allow us to change the direction of our policy from escalating militarily, as the President stubbornly pursues that policy, to a strategy of Iraqi self-control and stability in the region. I support the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as I listened to my very good friend from Vermont, my Rules

Committee colleague, Mr. WELCH, for whom I have the highest regard, he talked about the fact that the President was sticking his heels into the ground and was not willing to make any modifications whatsoever.

Well, I will acknowledge that the President has in fact, I would say to my friend from Vermont, Mr. WELCH, stuck his heels in the ground when it has come to his quest for victory, to ensure that we keep the battle against al Qaeda and those forces that would want to do us in in Iraq. What he has done in recognizing that mistakes have been made, in recognizing that there have been challenges, as has historically been the case in war, we have seen a dramatic change.

I don't know if my friends have noticed, but there is a new Secretary of Defense, his name is Robert Gates; and there have in fact been a number of changes made. I don't know if people have noticed, there is in fact a new commanding general on the ground in Iraq. His name is David Petraeus. As I said in my opening remarks, he has enjoyed strong bipartisan support.

Obviously, these military leaders, the Secretary of Defense and other military leaders, are insistent upon giving a very sober assessment of what is taking place and not providing an unrealistic, rosy picture of what is happening in Iraq. And they have reported, they have reported that we have in fact seen success, especially, as I said in my remarks, in Ramadi, what was determined to be one of the most dangerous cities on the face of the Earth; and we have now seen stability there, and this alliance which exists, Sunni, Shia and American forces working together to bring about this kind of peace and stability.

So while I am not saying there aren't difficult days, weeks, months, and, Mr. Speaker, I hope not, but possibly difficult years ahead in Iraq, the fact of the matter is this President has made it very clear that he is willing to make modifications so that we can in fact ensure victory over those who want to do us in.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1300

Mr. INSLEE. Who are the real experts on the question of whether the lack of a timeline actually fuels the insurgency, the lack of a timeline actually making the violence worse?

One of them is named Muhammad al-Dini. He is an elected member of the Iraqi parliament. He was here yesterday, and I met with him. He told me that a majority, 144 members, of the elected Iraqi parliament 2 days ago signed a petition that basically said that the lack of a timeline is fueling

attacks against our troops. The lack of a timeline is fueling this insurgency. The lack of a timeline is playing into the hands of al Qaeda. And the reason he told us this is that it allows them to go out and recruit and say, Look, America is going to be here forever. And they recruit people that go out and attack us.

The other thing he told us is that the Maliki government is using our taxpayer dollars to run sectarian militias that go out and attack Americans. He urged us to adopt a timeline. An elected official in the parliament of the state of Iraq; now there is an expert.

It amazes me that people who have been wrong on Iraq for 4 years come down and lecture us, lecture us about whether a timeline is going to work or not. I think it might be handy in Congress to have a penalty box. If you have been wrong for 4 years on the right strategy in Iraq, maybe you should to go into the penalty box for a while and allow the people who were against this war from the beginning to have a say on what we do in Iraq.

What we are saying is, a lack of a timeline hurts. We need to bleed the insurgency of the fuel they use, and the fuel they use is the lack of a timeline.

One more thing, I read this headline: "Bush Told War is Harming the GOP." I don't care about the GOP or the parties. The GOP members went and told the President this is hurting the GOP. It doesn't matter who is getting hurt politically here. I will tell you what matters: Our sons and daughters are being killed in Iraq.

I hope some of my GOP colleagues, the next time they go to the White House, I hope they say, we don't care about the GOP or the DEM; we care about the Army and the Navy and the soldiers who are being killed in Iraq, and let's get a timetable and get us out of there.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for allowing me the opportunity to speak this afternoon.

I strongly support the rule. I strongly support our men and women in uniform who are courageously fighting to defend our freedoms. In my own district, we lost 14 soldiers. My recent trip to Iraq confirmed that to support our troops is to support their redeployment. Our troops told me they were overextended and underequipped. Many are on their second, third and fourth tour. They face increased risk without proper equipment and longer stays. In fact, not enough equipment was available for those new incoming soldiers that were just deployed by this President. That is what I heard from our troops when I visited there about a month ago.

Extending the tours of all active-duty personnel is unacceptable, a price our families shouldn't have to pay, nor our troops. As Members of Congress, we have the responsibility to protect and

provide for the best interests of all of our troops. That includes the redeployment out of Iraq and a safe return home.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and vote for these bills to support our troops.

One last comment. I want to thank the Speaker of this House for having the courage to allow us to vote on these very important pieces of legislation this day. It is indeed a historic day.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to my very good friend from Dallas, the distinguished chair of the Republican Study Committee, Mr. HENSARLING.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. What happened to the most open and transparent and fair process that was supposed to occur in the history of Congress? We have a closed rule on top of a closed rule on top of a closed rule.

And now what we see is, yet again, the Democrats bringing a bill to the floor that our Secretary of Defense says is even worse than the last one they brought to the floor as far as tying the hands of our troops as they attempt to protect our freedom.

Once again we have a slow-bleed strategy for our troops in Iraq. Once again we still have a pork-laden supplemental.

Let's talk for a second about the ag bill. Now there is legitimate debate, and there may be legitimate reasons, and I agree that drought assistance may be necessary in certain parts of the country. But this is supposedly the PAYGO Congress? I have looked at this. Number one, where is the emergency? The drought took place last year. That is when the emergency was. Why isn't this going in regular order? Where is the offset?

Had there been an open rule, I would have been happy to offer an offset amendment. Once again, I don't know how anyone on this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, can call this the PAYGO Congress. There are so many holes in this PAYGO it looks beyond Swiss cheese. This is one of the worse rules that I have seen brought to the floor, and every Member should rise in opposition and defeat this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to another gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, year five of blunders, that is a true slow-bleed policy in Iraq.

Defeatism? Well, that is an Administration that lacks the courage to admit its failures and which pays for those failures with the blood of the brave, the blood of someone else, and with \$10 billion of your tax money every single month.

Gimmicks? Gimmicks are what got us into Iraq in the first place. It certainly wasn't the "war on terrorism."

You can make all of the excuses that you want for continuing to embed our troops in a civil war, but a vote today

for the Iraq Redeployment Act is a vote to end endless war. It is a vote for a fully funded, safe, and orderly redeployment that allows us to refocus on the war on terrorism, which is a threat to our families, rather than the civil war in Iraq, which is not.

It is not the enemy that has us pinned down in Iraq today; it is this Administration's unwillingness to admit its mistakes and its lies.

The intervention in Iraq was this country's largest foreign policy blunder. Now it is time for Congress to intervene. With this war in its fifth year, for Congress not to act now is for Congress to become an enabler and an accomplice to the Administration's errors.

Vice President CHENEY rightly complains about the Iraqis proposing to take a two-month vacation. But what is really at fault here is Mr. CHENEY and this Administration's four-year vacation from reality.

"Victory" is improving our families' security. Pursuing policies contrary to that objective, committing the same error over and over again, that is defeatist.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 7½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), who will explain why we didn't deal with agricultural disasters last year.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me simply say in response to the previous speaker on that side of the aisle, he claims that efforts on our part to withdraw our troops or redeploy our troops out of a combat situation represents a slow-bleed policy. I would suggest that the existing policy is a bleed-forever policy, and it needs to be changed.

The second question the gentleman asked referred to agriculture. He said, "Gee, these agriculture disasters occurred last year; why weren't they handled then?" That is a very good question. We weren't in charge last year. The other side was.

In fact, we have had agriculture disaster legislation pending for 2 years. The President declared 70 percent of the counties in this country to be disaster areas, and yet the last Congress couldn't put together a two-car funeral when it came to addressing that problem. So we are simply cleaning up in a separate bill; mind you, we are cleaning up last year's agriculture disaster problem. It is just another one of the leftover items from the previous Congress that we are now charged with the responsibility to finish.

Now let me get to what the real issue is in this bill.

The Washington Post carries a story this morning describing the efforts of the administration to use Iraqi government officials to try to get the Democratic lawmakers to ease the pressure on the White House to have a timetable for the withdrawal of troops. Mr. al-Rubaie is quoted as saying the following: "Now, nobody is talking about

sliding into a civil war, as we've been able to avoid it."

He added, "Portraying the scene there as Shiite killing Sunni and Sunnis killing Shiites is totally untrue."

What are they smoking? What do we see on television every day, despite the effort of the administration to shut down as much access on the part of the public to the carnage as is possible?

I strongly support this rule today for one simple reason: The President has asked the Congress to give him \$100 billion in additional funding to fight this war, no strings attached. The Congress passed a proposal and put it on the President's desk suggesting that there ought to be certain limitations on the President's conduct in return for getting the money. He vetoed that. He believes he is "the decider."

Well, under the Constitution, we are all supposed to be deciders. So now we have before us, in response to the President's action, a proposal to do three things: First of all, it would provide an opportunity to have an up-or-down vote on the issue of whether or not troops ought to be redeployed over the next year. I think that is what a democratic institution is supposed to do, to make choices like that.

Secondly, what we are proposing under this rule today will allow the Congress to require the President to report to the Congress on three things: First of all, since the President has said that, as Iraqi military units stand up, we should stand down, we have a sense of the Congress provision in this legislation which says that, as the President certifies that battalions have achieved full combat capability, that a certain number of corresponding U.S. units ought to stand down. It is not mandatory. It is a sense of the Congress that that ought to happen.

Secondly, we ask the President to report to the Congress on the progress that Iraq is making on the benchmarks that the President himself set out last fall as being the criteria by which we should judge Iraqi progress.

And then thirdly, so that it isn't a softball report, we are also asking that the President report to the Congress spelling out which of those benchmarks have actually been achieved. Has the Iraqi parliament actually passed an adequate oil revenue-sharing law which shares that oil equitably with Sunni, Shiites and Kurds alike, because if they don't do that, the Sunnis will never stop fighting?

And then, lastly, what we do is to set up a separate bill that deals with some of the domestic emergencies that we face that the President described as "pork." Among those is the agriculture disaster bill. And so we are considering that as a separate bill to demonstrate to the White House and to demonstrate to our critics that they are wrong when they say that we are afraid to let these programs stand on their own. So we are going to vote on them alone, and I happen to think they are in a stronger position when we vote on them alone.

It is going to be very interesting to see how many of our Republican friends from agricultural districts are actually going to support us in trying to provide that assistance.

□ 1315

After all, we did not declare those counties disaster areas. A fellow by the name of Bush did, and he's the guy that lives in that big white house, and when he makes a declaration like that, there ought to be certain consequences that flow from it, and we're simply meeting those obligations. So that's basically what we are trying to do.

As the gentleman from Washington said earlier, we simply happen to believe, those of us who are going to be supporting this proposition, we simply happen to believe that it would be nice if we were fighting the right war in the right place rather than the wrong war in the wrong place, and the right place to be taking al Qaeda on is in Afghanistan.

Now, we also provide in our proposition, we say that 60 days after or 60 days from now roughly, by July 13, by the time this bill is passed, by July 13, we guarantee the administration that the Congress will have an up-or-down vote on its own request for all the money. I don't know what more we can do.

What we are simply doing is we are letting the President report, letting him give his judgments to us. We then give the Congress about 10 days to absorb what the President has said, and then we vote, up or down, on two issues: number one, whether the President should get all the remaining money; and, number two, there's another amendment that would simply have us instead use that money to re-deploy our troops out of combat.

It's a fair, square deal. The administration gets a straight shot at what it wants and war critics get a straight shot at what they want. That, to me, is eminently fair.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I had one Member who was hoping to come over, and I do not see him here. So I'm going to yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, we all know how painful the war in Iraq has been. As I said in my opening remarks and throughout this debate, no one is trying to paint a rosy picture of the situation there.

My very good friend from Wisconsin, distinguished Chair of the Appropriations Committee, has just told us that we should be fighting the war in the right place. Well, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that we have found tragically over the past several years is that al Qaeda can be found almost anywhere on the face of the Earth.

It was just a few months ago that we saw a successful effort by the Ethiopians going into Mogadishu, Somalia, to liberate that capital from the forces of al Qaeda. We know very well that on September 11, 2001, al Qaeda attacked us here in the United States, and we regularly go through the litany of the

actions of al Qaeda, Hamas, Hezbollah: the bombing of the two embassies, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania and Nairobi, Kenya; the USS Cole; the Khobar Towers; the World Trade Center in 1993.

We can go on and on and on about al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations. And guess what, Mr. Speaker, virtually everyone has acknowledged that the front line in the battle against al Qaeda is where they are mostly, and that is in Iraq.

Now, I just reported the great statement that came from our new ambassador, Ryan Crocker, in Iraq who has talked along with General Petraeus about the success that we have seen in the al Anbar province, in Ramadi in particular, one of the most dangerous spots on the face of the Earth until we saw this alliance develop among Sunni, Shia and American forces standing up against al Qaeda because, Mr. Speaker, al Qaeda is there in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I truly believe that fighting al Qaeda in Iraq plays a big role in preventing them from attacking us right here in the United States of America, which is obviously their goal. They have done it before, and they would love to do it again.

This process around which we are considering this measure is very unusual to say the least. In fact, my good friend from Rochester, distinguished Chair of the Rules Committee, described this rule as one of the most complicated that we have ever seen.

Now, my good friend again, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, just talked about the fact that we are going to give the President his chance to see this. Well, here is what we are going to give the President. We are going to give the President a bill that potentially calls for cut-and-run and immediate withdrawal within 90 days, beginning a pullout of our troops in Iraq; number two, a supplemental appropriations bill that has all of this re-deployment that creates fits and starts, beginning and reduction, just incrementally putting it out, which has been harshly criticized by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gates; General Petraeus; Ambassador Crocker and others. So that is included in this measure, and then the agricultural appropriations provision.

Now, my friend from Wisconsin just asked how many Members will stand up and be supportive of the effort that I laud in dealing with something that we were not able to deal with in the last Congress as we struggled with the appropriations process, that, among others, being this agricultural appropriations issue, with the disasters that we have faced. And of course, there will be Members on our sides of the aisle who will support that.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think we need to recognize that this is the most convoluted process because we are not allowing it to stand on its own. What we are doing with this rule is we are taking all three of these very separate items, linking them up, and sending

them to our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol in the United States Senate, where the majority leader, Senator HARRY REID, the one who's already announced that we've lost the war in Iraq, he said there's very little chance of success there.

That's why I have always considered myself, I like to have that Jeffersonian spirit of a healthy skepticism, as opposed to a corrosive cynicism, which sometimes we have seen more than a few people slip to around here. But I can't help but be skeptical. I'm not going to be cynical, Mr. Speaker, but I can't help but be a little skeptical as we look at the one, two, three punch of vote after vote after vote when we know full well it will most likely die in the Senate; and if it by chance, as this last bill did, ends up getting to the President, it's going to be vetoed by the President.

So as I said earlier, it allows our colleagues to stand up, as so many have, during this debate saying they support the troops, but at the same time they want to get out immediately and not provide the troops with the kind of consistency and support that they need for us to be victorious.

Again, one of the interesting things that we hear, as we juxtapose the debate that emanates from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle and ours, is that we regularly talk about victory. We regularly talk about being victorious in this battle against Islamic extremism, the battle which we all united to fight on September 11, 2001. It is tragic that we have gotten to the point where we are not united on this.

And I will acknowledge that there were some who tried to exude the image that Iraq was involved on September 11, and I never said that and most people I know never claimed that Saddam Hussein was involved in command and control of what happened on September 11, 2001; but, Mr. Speaker, I will say this: Saddam Hussein had the exact same goal for the future of the United States as al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden, and that's why we need to be prepared to fight them at any spot whatsoever.

I am going to offer when, I say "when" because I am going to be an eternal optimist, when we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer the amendment that I was speaking about earlier.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that just before the vote on the previous question that the text of my amendment that I am going to be submitting when we defeat the previous question be made in order, and I ask unanimous consent that that be included in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LYNCH). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. And let me just briefly say that that amendment says that

when the President of the United States reports to the Congress that on the success in training or lack of success in training the Iraqi security forces, that that report not be made available to the leadership of al Qaeda by way of the Internet.

The amendment that I am going to offer when we defeat the previous question, Mr. Speaker, is an amendment that will allow us to say that we will strike the provision that says that the report from the President to the Congress is provided on the Internet for the world to see. We should not be feeding our enemies, those who want to kill us, with this kind of information.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to urge defeat of the previous question, and when we defeat that, I urge support of my quest to make the amendment in order that will allow us to prevent the President's report from getting on to the Internet for our enemy to see, and if by chance I am not successful, I urge defeat of the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to contradict my colleague from California, but we do not know the pain of this war. Members of Congress know it a little better than most people because we try to comfort the bereaved and visit the ones who are maimed, but we don't really know the pain of this war. We can't know about the 35,000 or more young people with life-altering wounds, people 18 and 19 years old who will live with them for the very rest of their lives.

We don't know the loss other people have sustained because nothing much is required of us except to pay the bill of \$10 billion a month, mostly borrowed from China, so we can finance this war.

There is no compelling reason why we should go on forever with this. Nothing that we are asking the President to put on the Internet is anything but classified and who is going to believe it anyway.

If the President is running out of money for the troops, it is simply because he vetoed the money that he asked us for that we sent to him. The fault, the blame lies exclusively with him.

And with that I ask all of my colleagues to vote for this rule on both sides of the House. Obviously, numbers of them didn't want to come down and talk today. Please vote for this rule. Cleanse your conscience. Let's do a good thing today for those people who count on us in Iraq.

The material previously referred to by Mr. DREIER is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 387 OFFERED BY MR. DREIER OF CALIFORNIA

(1) Amend section 2 to read as follows:

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2206) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The

amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority the Committee member of Appropriations; (2) the amendment printed in section 6, if offered by Representative Dreier of California or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

(2) At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. The amendment referred to in section 2 is as follows:

Strike section 1326(f) (relating to the public availability of information regarding the combat proficiency of Iraqi security forces).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE FRED UPTON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable FRED UPTON, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, May 9, 2007.

HON. NANCY PELOSI,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you pursuant to rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that a judicial subpoena for trial testimony, issued by the United States Court of Federal Claims, has been delivered to my District Office.

After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by rule VIII.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,  
Member of Congress.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2082, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 388 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 388

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2082) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 9 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 2082 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1330

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the Clerk just read, House Resolution 388 provides for consideration of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 under a structured rule.

The rule makes in order a total of ten amendments, almost half of which will be offered by Members of the minority, including one which will be offered by the ranking member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Representative HOEKSTRA.

The rule also makes in order an amendment that I offered, along with my colleague on the Intelligence Committee, Representative ROGERS of Michigan, and our bipartisan amendment is a commonsense solution to holding the Office of National Director of intelligence accountable for its actions.

The House will have a chance to debate our amendment later today, and I hope my colleagues will support it.

I would like to point out that Members who wish to do so, as the Chair of the Intelligence Committee has pointed out previously, can go to the Intelligence Committee office to examine the classified schedule of authorizations for the programs and activities of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the national and military intelligence programs.

The importance of the intelligence community touches all Americans as our Nation's first line of defense against increasing world threats. Effective intelligence is the first method to protect our citizens and prevent debacles like the war in Iraq.

The underlying legislation authorizes funding for all United States intelligence agencies, including the national and military intelligence programs. It is the largest intelligence authorization bill ever considered by the House and takes significant steps to eliminate duplication and ineffectiveness in our intelligence agencies.

The bill increases funding to improve human intelligence, training and send additional intelligence analysts overseas to maximize their abilities. It also requires additional intelligence reports on North Korea and Iranian efforts to become nuclear capable. We also take significant steps to improve the collecting, deciphering and understanding of intelligence.

The effectiveness of our intelligence community is significantly jeopardized when the diversity of the intelligence community does not reflect the diverse

world in which we live. Women and minorities continue to be disproportionately underrepresented in the senior ranks and the core mission areas of analysis, human intelligence collection, and science and technology.

Simply put, we still do not have an intelligence community that looks like our country or the world. Minorities make up 37 percent of the American population, yet only 21 percent of the intelligence community, and the numbers for African-Americans and Latinos is woefully below that number. This is a problem that is addressed in the underlying bill, which requires the development of a strategic plan to increase diversity within the intelligence community and mandates increased diversity among the rank and file of the community.

I am fond of saying in the Intelligence Committee hearings that it doesn't take more degrees than the thermometer to be a spy, but somebody back there decided that that must have been the case.

Another significant concern exacerbated by this lack of diversity is a deficiency of linguist abilities in the intelligence community. There are countless stories of intelligence tapes that had piled up in the months leading up to September 11 when the terrorist attacks occurred here. That was done because we didn't have anyone to translate them.

Experts and administrators lament the fact that we don't have enough Arabic, Farsi, Urdu or Dari speakers, and we always go in that direction, but we don't have enough Asian language speakers, either, in the intelligence community and the military.

How can we expect to completely correct that course without thoroughly modernizing the recruitment, selection and security clearance processes to quickly bring on board people with these critical skills? The underlying bill provides for the commonsense modernization of our security clearance procedures to address this growing problem, requiring that the system make more efficient use of those who are proficient in foreign languages or with cultural, linguistic or other subject matter expertise that is critical to national security. We must make these necessary modernizations to adapt to the ever-changing threats around us.

Finally, following the recommendations of 11 three- and four-star generals, the bill requests that the National Intelligence Council produce a National Intelligence Estimate on the national security impact of global climate change. Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have expressed discontent with this provision, because they believe that enough research is currently under way about climate change. In doing so, in my judgment, they failed to recognize that climate change is impacting global security.

Just look at the Middle East, the battle for scarce resources among those

who have been displaced, particularly in Iraq, has the potential to generate sociopolitical environments that foster the creation of terrorist cells. If we can't even agree on the implications of climate change, it is obvious that more research is necessary, especially observing the impact of climate change on the movement of people and resources, and how that connects to terrorism.

Footnote right there, I pointed out in the Rules Committee that Iraq would be the classic example of what I am talking about. There are 2 million refugees, and it is almost like it is kind of hidden, that are displaced from their homes in Iraq. There are 400,000 to 500,000 internally displaced in Iraq. Yet, what we find is they are being pushed into Syria, Jordan and Egypt where there are already significant water resource problems. Someone tell me how that doesn't equate to an environment where terrorists will be produced.

If we can't agree on this, I can assure you that we are going to have significant problems in the future. Even the National Defense University has recognized these implications by prioritizing response to large-scale national disasters in some of its most recent training simulations. As scientists explore the connection between such disasters and climate change, it is imperative that the national security implications of such events be thoroughly understood.

I am glad that our committee addresses this issue in the bill. If we have learned anything from the failures of the war in Iraq, it is that reliable intelligence is critical to ensuring America's national security.

I am pleased to support this rule and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this restrictive rule.

The Intelligence Authorization Act generally receives strong bipartisan support. But let me be clear that the underlying bill does contain bipartisan provisions that are important to protecting our national security, make no bones about that.

However, the bill also contains a number of provisions that are of concern and could weaken our national security and intelligence capabilities by providing less than adequate resources and placing restrictions on our intelligence operations.

I am concerned that the Democratic leadership chose to include section 407 in the underlying bill. My friend from Florida talked at length about that provision, which would require our Nation's intelligence community to direct



its limited resources to a National Intelligence Estimate on global climate change.

I have to ask, what message are we sending to our allies and our enemies when Congress instructs our intelligence experts to stop what they are doing on issues that threaten American lives and, instead, focus on theoretical risks from global warming.

Furthermore, earlier this year, this House created a new Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming to focus on the risks of global warming. This is in addition to several Federal agencies that are already analyzing climate change. Congress should let this panel that was created, and existing Federal agencies, focus on climate change so that our intelligence analysts can focus on materials of classified information and work to prevent threats against American lives.

But I am pleased, I have to say, with the Rules Committee last night because they made in order an amendment to be offered by the ranking member, Mr. HOEKSTRA, of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, that will strike section 407 and allow our spies to be spies. I think we can have a very good debate on that. I think we ought to have that debate. I am pleased that the Rules Committee made that amendment in order.

However, the Democratic leadership did deny several thoughtful amendments offered by Mr. CASTLE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this restrictive rule, which only allows 10 out of 433 Members of the House to offer their ideas on how to better strengthen our intelligence community.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1345

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. At this time, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, my good friend from Texas (Mr. REYES).

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and good friend from Florida for yielding me time on this very important rule.

I rise in support of this rule. The terrorist plot that was recently uncovered in New Jersey this past week shows that we cannot let our guard down in the effort to learn the plans and intentions of people who would do us grave harm.

The underlying bill, H.R. 2082, provides funding for the brave women and men of our intelligence community. I have visited with them in every corner of the world, and I am constantly amazed by their patriotism, their dedication to mission, and their commitment to doing our Nation's most sensitive and dangerous business, often without public acknowledgement or recognition.

Today, the United States faces a dynamic set of threats, challenges, and opportunities. We are at war in Iraq and Afghanistan. We face a growing terrorist threat. Countries like Iran and North Korea are working towards a nuclear bomb. And we face a number of other key challenges in Africa, Latin America, and from rising powers like Russia and China. These major challenges require a major effort by our government to collect, to analyze, and to disseminate intelligence, and to do so within the legal bounds of our Constitution and our national values.

This bill invests in human intelligence. It invests in analysis and analysts. It funds key counterterrorism operations and sensitive collection programs. And it improves critical oversight in key areas such as the overuse of contractors and the lack of qualified linguists in the intelligence business.

This bill was developed on a bipartisan basis. And although there may not be agreement on every single point, there is agreement on all the major points. This rule will allow a full debate on many of the key issues before us, and I, along with my colleagues, should welcome this debate. So I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 6 minutes to the gentlelady from New Mexico, a member of the Intelligence Committee, Mrs. WILSON.

(Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I am here to urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and to oppose the previous question on the rule for the Intelligence authorization bill today.

I offered an amendment in the Rules Committee that was similar to one that I offered in the Intelligence Committee that would modernize our foreign intelligence surveillance laws so that we can listen to the terrorists trying to kill us, while protecting Americans' civil liberties.

Every member of the House Intelligence Committee knows that the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act is not working, and so does the Speaker of the House. In fact, she has been briefed on this earlier than any of us have, since shortly after 9/11.

Last week, in unclassified session in front of the Senate Intelligence Committee, Admiral Mike McConnell, the Director of National Intelligence, urged the Congress to modernize our intelligence surveillance laws. He told us and the world, "We are actually missing a significant portion of what we should be getting." We are missing a significant portion of what we should be getting.

In January of this year, the Attorney General of the United States wrote to the Congress and said there were new Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court orders that were innovative, that

would put the President's terrorist surveillance program underneath the auspices of a judge in the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court. They are innovative, because the court is stretching the law like a twin sheet over a king-sized bed. And every member of the Intelligence Committee knows just how fragile the legal framework is in this arrangement. Yet, a single judge in a nonadversarial secret setting has said it is okay to go forward on this basis because it is important to the country, and the Congress has failed to act. Will the next judge go along?

Every one of us knows there is a problem. Here is the problem:

In 1978, almost all local calls were on wire and almost all long distance calls were transmitted by microwave over the air. The FISA law distinguishes between collection over a wire and collection over the air. You don't need a FISA warrant to collect signals over the air. And that is where long-haul communications were in 1978.

Now, in 21st-century communications, the situation is completely reversed. Most long-haul communications are on wire and most local calls are over the air. 230 million Americans have cell phones, but the FISA law we operate under is stuck in the 1970s, while we are trying to protect this country from terrorists who are exploiting the 21st-century technology that was invented by this great country. We are tying the hands of our intelligence agencies while our enemies are using these communication systems to plot to kill Americans.

But the rule is even worse than that. The committee has ruled in order an amendment by Mr. FLAKE and Mr. SCHIFF that insists, insists that our intelligence agencies must use this outdated 1978 law. What do you think the FISA judges are going to think when they see that pass the House of Representatives?

We are actually missing a significant portion of what we should be getting. What did we miss today? What are the terrorists plotting today? What are they talking about that is flowing over the wires that America built today? Who is going to die tomorrow because you won't let our Intelligence Committees listen to the foreign communications on a wire and you will not allow a debate on this floor on this very important issue?

I pray to God that we don't need another 9/11 Commission to look at what our failures were in intelligence. Because if we have to look at failures, if we have to look at whether we should have done something when we had a chance, then mark this vote on this day in history, when the Democrat majority in this House chose to tie our hands in the face of a determined enemy.

If we defeat the previous question on this rule, we will offer the amendment to modernize our intelligence surveillance laws to update them for 21st-century technology. A vote in favor of the

previous question on this rule is a vote to keep the FISA law frozen in time in 1978, while our enemies use 21st-century communications to plot to kill Americans.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question and “no” on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Rule for debate and the previous question on the Intelligence Authorization Bill today.

This vote is more important than most procedural things we do around here.

I offered an amendment in the Rules Committee that would modernize our Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Laws so that we can listen to the terrorists trying to kill us and protect the civil liberties of Americans.

Every member of the House Intelligence Committee knows that the FISA law is not working, and so does the Speaker of the House. She has been briefed on these matters since shortly after 9/11—long before any of us were.

Last week, in unclassified session in front of the Senate Intelligence Committee, Admiral Mike McConnell, the Director of National Intelligence urged the Congress to modernize this law. He told us and the world, “We are actually missing a significant portion of what we should be getting.”

In classified session, the details of the problems are even worse.

On January 17, 2007 the Attorney General told the Congress that there were new Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court orders that are “innovative”.

They are “innovative” because the court is stretching the law like a twin sized sheet to cover a king sized bed.

And every member of the Intelligence Committee knows just how fragile this legal arrangement is.

Yet, a single judge in a non-adversarial secret session allowed it is important to the security of the country and because the Congress has failed to act.

Will the next judge continue to stretch the law?

#### THE PROBLEM

In 1978 almost all local calls were on wire and almost all long-haul calls were over the air.

The FISA law distinguishes between collection on a wire and collection out of the air.

You don't need a FISA warrant to collect foreign intelligence over the air.

Now, in 21st century communications, the situation is completely reverse.

Most long-haul communications are on a wire and local calls are in the air.

But the calls we want, for foreign intelligence information, are on the wires and fiber optic cables.

The FISA law we operate under is stuck in the 1970s while we are trying to protect this country from enemies that use 21st century communications.

We're tying the hands of our intelligence agencies while our enemies are using the communications systems we built to plot to kill us.

#### BUT IT GETS WORSE

But the rule is even worse than that.

The committee has ruled in order an amendment by Mr. FLAKE and Mr. SCHIFF that says our agencies must use this outdated 1978 law.

The Democrat leadership will insist that we turn our backs on 21st century terrorists, using 21st century communications and pretend we can be frozen in a 1978 world.

“We are actually missing a significant portion of what we should be getting,” said our Director of National Intelligence.

What did we miss today?

What are the terrorists plotting today?

Who is going to die tomorrow because you won't let our intelligence agencies listen to foreign communications on a wire?

I pray to God we never need another “9/11 Commission” that looks at how we failed to protect ourselves when we could have done something.

If we do, mark this vote, this day in history, when the Democrat majority in this House chose to tie our hands in the face of a determined enemy.

A vote in favor of the previous question on this rule is a vote to keep the FISA law frozen in time in 1978 while our enemies use 21st century communications to plot to kill Americans.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question and “no” on the rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California, my friend Ms. HARMAN, who is the previous ranking member of the Select Committee on Intelligence, and is a member of the newly appointed Special Intelligence Oversight Panel.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HASTINGS for yielding to me and commend him for his continued service both on the Intelligence Committee and on the Rules Committee.

As you heard, I served the past 8 years on the Intelligence Committee, the last 4 as ranking member. I loved that opportunity, and I remain passionate about the issues. I believe that there is nothing more central to our roles in Congress than to keep our country safe. And that committee has crucial jurisdiction.

I would respectfully disagree with the comments of the last speaker, Mrs. WILSON. I have been briefed longer than she has on how the so-called NSA program operates. I believed then and I believe now that it can and must fully comply with FISA, a law that has been modernized 12 times since 9/11 through changes we have made which I supported in the PATRIOT Act.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and of H.R. 2082. In my current role as Chair of the Homeland Security Intelligence Information Sharing and Terrorism Risk Assessment Subcommittee, I continue to review intelligence reports and to talk to our key security professionals. And, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned. We have surged our intelligence resources into Iraq, where they are necessarily focused on the tactical needs of warfighters. Meanwhile, al Qaeda has gained strength and is inspiring new cells worldwide. We have taken our eye off the ball. That ball is al Qaeda.

Mr. Speaker, we should all be worried that terrorist cells are here in the

United States, right now, waiting for the right moment to strike. We have yet to develop a truly effective system for sharing time-sensitive intelligence about terror plots with first responders, whom I would like to believe could be first preventers.

Even at the Federal level, a variety of data bases, classifications, and pseudo-classification systems could still, 5½ years after 9/11, prevent us from connecting the dots. We have yet to develop an adequate strategy to counter radicalization in our prisons and in our communities. The events at Cherry Hill, New Jersey, earlier this week are the latest example. And we have not yet broken into the inner circle of the senior al Qaeda leadership even though we have been at this for more than 5 years. These problems are urgent as we could be attacked at any time.

I recently reviewed the classified annex to this bill and continue to pay special attention to our technical satellite programs. Changes to these programs cannot be discussed in an unclassified setting such as this; but I want to reiterate my long-held view that the women and men who build these systems constitute a major strategic asset of the United States. Rocket scientists do not grow on trees, and we must keep them highly trained and highly motivated. Without their help, we could literally lose our ability to see, hear, and communicate.

Finally, I strongly support the effort to develop a National Intelligence Estimate on climate change. Changes in our climate will affect critical resources such as water, food, and arable land, as we are seeing now in Darfur and in many parts of Africa. Droughts affect the stability of governments, and the stability of governments is one of the key things we need to know about through our intelligence. This isn't bugs and bunnies, or even Bugs Bunny. It is survival or destruction. And if we make responsible moves now, our grandchildren will benefit.

Mr. Speaker, by supporting this legislation, the Congress stands with the extraordinary women and men of our intelligence community who often serve in austere locations on unaccompanied assignments. I am one of the few here who know these people and know where they serve. I say to them, our Nation owes you our gratitude; hopefully, this bill provides the support and tools you need as well as honors your sacrifice.

I urge support of the rule. I urge support of the underlying legislation, and I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 388, the rule for consideration of the fiscal year 2008 Intelligence Authorization Act.

As a former member of the House Select Committee on Intelligence, I strongly believe we must enact all of the 9/11 Commission's intelligence recommendations, even those that apply to our own congressional committees.

In its final report, the 9/11 Commission concluded that: "Of all our recommendations, strengthening congressional oversight may be among the most difficult and important. So long as oversight is governed by the current congressional rules and resolutions, we believe the American people will not get the security they want and need."

The bipartisan 9/11 Commission Report and the subsequent 9/11 Public Disclosure Project recommended three alternatives for reforming congressional oversight of intelligence. These options include: one, establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence modeled after the old Joint Committee on Atomic Energy; two, establishing House and Senate Committees on Intelligence with authorizing and appropriating authority; or, three, establishing a new Appropriations Subcommittee on Intelligence.

□ 1400

In the wake of the terrorist attacks of 2001, Congress enacted a large majority of the Commission's recommendations. However, as it turns out, it has been those recommendations that apply directly to the tangled rules and procedures here in the United States Congress that have been left unfinished.

Earlier this year the Democratic leadership attempted to apply a Band-Aid to this problem by creating a powerless Intelligence Oversight Panel that has very little control over actual funding decisions. This is clearly not what the 9/11 Commission recommended. In fact, its report plainly states that, "tinkering with the existing committee structure is not sufficient."

This week I offered a simple amendment to the bill before us, calling for a sense of Congress that this House should act to implement these crucial 9/11 recommendations, but it was denied under this rule.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have insisted that we implement all of these important recommendations, even those that are difficult. We will be doing this country a disservice until we put in place an effective committee structure capable of giving our national intelligence agencies the oversight, support and leadership they need.

I urge the defeat of the rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to inform each side of the remaining amount of time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 14½ minutes, and the gentleman from Washington has 19 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time

to yield 4 minutes to my good friend from New Jersey, with whom I serve on the Select Committee on Intelligence, and he is the Chair of the Special Intelligence Oversight Panel, Mr. HOLT.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from Florida. It is indeed a pleasure and an education to serve with him on the Intelligence Committee.

And I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill. Although this bill is not the full reform that I think is needed, it does contain many features that, if enacted, will improve the operation and oversight of the intelligence community.

I'd like to address one amendment that has been made in order, and I thank the Rules Committee for accepting for consideration an amendment that I offer that seeks to address an issue that's been one of the highest concerns for both this committee and the Congress, and that is, protecting the security and the cover of intelligence officers.

This grows out, in part, of the well publicized outing of a former CIA officer. For nearly 4 years, I have led the effort within the committee and in this body to determine the facts surrounding this case, as well as its consequences for the security of our Nation.

In previous Congresses, on eight separate occasions, in committee and on this floor, the then majority voted down every effort to obtain information on the matter. As I repeatedly noted at the time, Mr. Fitzgerald's criminal inquiry could never address some of the key questions that we sought to have answers for.

For example, how and why did Ms. Plame's cover status become known to those with no legitimate need to know?

How much damage was done to our intelligence collection efforts as a result of the outing of Ms. Plame?

What measures has the CIA and has the now Director of National Intelligence taken to prevent similar compromises in the future?

We still need answers to these and other questions. The amendment I am offering today that I will offer, would require the President, through the Director of National Intelligence, to report annually to the Congress on the need for any modification to the Intelligence Identities Protection Act to improve the legal protections for covert agents. This report, along with other oversight that the committee will undertake, and that I hope to undertake through the Select Intelligence Oversight Panel, will help us establish exactly what measures need to be taken to minimize the chances of such compromises of the identities of covert operatives in the future.

These men and women take enormous risks on our behalf. We owe it to them to ensure their identities are protected from the exposure, both from hostile intelligence services but even from those within our own government

who would seek to retaliate against them for speaking truth to power.

This reporting requirement would be an amended version of what the President is already required to do, but has failed to do every year. We seek to have the President show more diligence in protecting the cover of these employees.

Let me reiterate that this amendment represents only one step in the process. The chairman of the committee has assured me that there will be oversight and legislative action on this issue in addition to that which we are taking today.

I would also like to comment that it is astonishing in the debates leading up to this in committee and here on the floor today that there would be so much attention being paid to the request for a national intelligence estimate on climate change. A preliminary assessment is already in the works. We should want the intelligence community to be considering everything that affects our national security, be it demographics or climate or droughts. I am astonished that there would be any resistance to having such a national intelligence estimate. So I am pleased that the committee has put that in this bill, and I look forward to its passage.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise to commend the majority for including, under the rule, the amendment that will be offered later by Mr. HOEKSTRA, the ranking minority member, former chairman of the committee, to strike section 407 of the bill. This is the section of the bill that so many people have commented on so far today that will now task our national intelligence resources to start looking at the issue of climate change.

To me there is a great irony in this happening here today because for many years we have heard criticism from Democrats over and over again on the so-called inefficiencies, inadequacies of our national intelligence capabilities, specially as it related to WMD in Iraq and their failure to get an accurate picture of that. And now we see today an expansion of their duties and responsibilities.

I believe most Americans look for our intelligence agencies not to be engaged on the issue of climate change but more directly to be involved in the business of protecting American safety and security, protecting our national assets, protecting the American people.

Furthermore, one of the other things that strikes me as greatly ironic about this is, we have an extensive array of Federal agencies currently studying this issue. We have NOAA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, which has a wide array of satellites and scientists that are constantly studying both short-term and

long-term implications of climate change.

We have, additionally, NASA engaged on this issue, with three major Earth-observing satellites on orbit studying the issue of the Earth's climate.

And as well, there are multiple programs run by the National Science Foundation; they have the Geosciences Directorate (GEO), the Office of Polar Programs (OPP), the Atmospheric Science Subactivity, the ATM. And, ladies and gentlemen, I haven't even touched on the EPA and all the work that they are doing on this issue.

To me, this issue is controversial. There is a sizeable number of Americans who feel that the severity of the problem of climate change does not justify some of the extreme actions that many people in the radical environmental community are trying to propose today, and I just can't help but feel this is a political issue to try to hijack our intelligence assets to get them on the global warming bandwagon so we could have draconian changes in American policy that could adversely affect our economy and our Nation.

So I thank the majority for putting the Hoekstra amendment in order. Mr. HOEKSTRA, the former chairman, now ranking member, is very knowledgeable on intelligence policy.

I intend on supporting the Hoekstra amendment. I encourage all my colleagues to listen carefully to that debate.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in extending time.

I, too, am perplexed by the debate that is being advanced in terms of being able to focus on the national security implications of the threat of global warming. I sat on the committee, the Special Committee on Global Warming and Energy Independence, as we listened to three and four star admirals and generals, as we listened to the former head of the CIA talking about the defense implications for the United States of Global Warming.

These men were not radical environmentalists. These are respected experts who have led a lifetime of service to protecting the integrity, the defense, the security of the United States. They are deeply concerned that our dependence on foreign oil from unstable areas of the world. The overwhelming scientific consensus that climate change, global warming is a reality, led them to argue in the most strong terms that we need to be serious about it. Item after item, about the strategic implications, about what happens to defenses of the United States, to instability around the world of water-stressed areas, to new disease patterns, these are not arcane, philosophical issues. This isn't environmental fringe. This is

the nuts, and bolts of the future, of our country.

It has already been made clear that we already have a great deal of work that is underway. What this would require is assembling it under the guise and guidance of people who are experts in national security to put it in the national security context.

Other major countries around the world are grappling with this. I think the Rules Committee was entirely appropriate to put what I think is a misguided amendment on the floor because I think it is time for people who care about the future of the country, who are looking at the evidence, to have an honest and thoughtful debate.

But to somehow dismiss this as the province of radical environmentalism or a detraction from the hard work of planning for America's security future is, I think, sadly misplaced.

I appreciate what the Rules Committee has done. I support the rule and look forward to the debate later.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, we have a process here with regard to legislation and how it moves through the Congress. In particular, the rules were changed in January, some very welcome changes to the rules with regard to earmarks.

We said that if you are going to have an earmark in a bill, or in a report, that you need to state that you do not have a financial interest in that earmark, and then you need to submit that earmark, or it has to be submitted with the report so that Members can actually see that and see that there is no financial interest, see if it has merit or warrant.

This process is not being followed here. We were told initially that there were no earmarks in the bill, and then those of us who went up to view the classified annex did not see a list. There was no list available there. We were told later that it was with the Clerk's Office. Then with the Parliamentarians.

It turned out that we finally did get the list, and here it is, 26 earmarks in the bill. But the list was not made public. It was not given to us until 5 hours after the deadline that the Rules Committee had established to submit your amendments.

So somebody who wanted to amend the bill or actually challenge or to highlight or to discuss the earmarks that are mentioned here and listed here did not have an opportunity to craft an amendment.

Again, this list was received, it was made public 5 hours after the Rules Committee already shut down the amendment process. This rule cannot go forward like this. We cannot continue to do business like this.

□ 1415

We all know the problems that we have had with the appropriations proc-

ess with the earmarking, the scandals that have gone on. The earmarking process is secretive enough, it seems, in the Congress without adding the layer of the Intelligence Committee. Then there are things that you can't even discuss on the floor, that we can't discuss openly; so it makes it even more difficult.

Members need not be reminded that Duke Cunningham now sits in prison because of earmarks he largely got in the intelligence process, in the Intelligence Committee. We cannot allow that to happen again. We have to have a process that makes sure that that cannot happen. And that process is not happening right now, when you don't get lists until long after the process, when you can't challenge them on the floor. And then we have the problem here in open session where you can't even challenge the earmark and talk about what the earmark is actually about because you are in open session and you might be talking about classified things.

So for that reason I am announcing now that I will offer a motion to move into secret session after these votes are concluded.

Let me just remind the Members, if you want a process where you know what is going on, we have to move into secret session. If you vote against the motion to go into secret session, you are, in essence, saying let's just let it go; I don't care what is in there.

I would challenge those who want to see what is going on to go up and view the classified annex. You may or may not be able to find out what these earmarks are about. But with this process, the way it is, we will never know, and we can't continue this.

I applauded the majority's move to new earmark rules in January. They were, I felt, stronger than what we did when we were in the majority. I think they should have been stronger, but they were better than what we did, and I said so. But we aren't following those rules.

We have already highlighted a few times that if the majority submits a list of earmarks, incomplete or complete, or simply states there are no earmarks in a bill, there is no parliamentary recourse for the minority or for anyone on the floor. We have to accept at face value that there are no earmarks or that the list is complete. That is wrong. That is something that has to change.

But when we are dealing with the Intelligence Committee on something this important, we can't let this process go forward without adopting some of the reforms that we have said that we are going to adopt.

So for that reason I will offer a motion for a secret session at the appropriate time, and I would urge a vote against this rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I say through the Chair to my friend from Washington that I thought that we were having our last speakers

but I didn't know the nature and substance of his last speaker's remarks toward that end.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes now to the distinguished Chair of the Select Committee on Intelligence, who has comments regarding Mr. FLAKE's comments.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just wanted to assure my friend and colleague from Arizona that, being sensitive to the issues that he mentioned about one of our former colleagues that, regrettably, now sits in prison, the Intelligence Committee worked very closely with the Parliamentarians, the Committee on Standards and Official Conduct, and other committees of the House on earmark disclosures.

I am at a loss as to who informed the gentleman that there would be no earmarks, but I think the gentleman now knows that the Government Printing Office made an error in omitting the earmarks and that is why the delay in putting them up on their Web site.

Be that as it may, this committee followed the requirements of the House for each Member receiving an earmark to certify that neither he or she nor his or her spouse would benefit financially from any kind of action. We complied with all the requirements, all the rules, and all the regulations.

As I said, we did this in a very transparent and bipartisan way because we did not want to leave any impressions that things were not done according to the rules that had been set out. Everything that we did with this process followed the rules and the process. Where the glitch came was where the printing was done. There was an error committed by the Government Printing Office, and that is why there was a delay in posting the earmarks.

Again, I am at a loss as to who informed the gentleman that there were no earmarks, because it certainly wasn't anyone from the committee that I am aware of.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REYES. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I believe the requirement in the House rules is that the report be filed 72 hours before it is brought up. Actually, those of us who went up to view the classified annex, I asked for the list, if there was a list of earmarks, and I was told there was none.

Mr. REYES. Reclaiming my time just to explain to you that our process in the committee is that you would be provided support from the Republican staff.

If they misinformed the gentleman about the issue of earmarks, I don't know why they would do that because clearly staff on both sides knew that there were earmarks.

I will continue to yield.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes, I reviewed and asked during that time if there were. I would say if it is

the case that a computer glitch led to no printing of the list, then you would think that the Rules Committee would say, okay, maybe we should move the process back and allow Members to offer amendments on specific earmarks.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, it is my understanding that the gentleman was offered an opportunity to do that and rejected it.

Mr. FLAKE. An unspecified opportunity. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, I actually offered an amendment that was rejected by the Rules Committee just encompassing all earmarks that might be in the bill because I wasn't given a list. I had no idea if there were any earmarks. And that was rejected.

The problem we have here in open session and the reason I will be calling to move into secret session is that in open session it is difficult to actually discuss what the earmark might be about.

Mr. REYES. I am being again reassured by staff, reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman was offered, less than an hour ago, unanimous consent to allow him to have an amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, what I was offered about 30 minutes ago was an opportunity to offer perhaps a few amendments with regard to specific earmarks. It was never clear how many amendments I would be allowed to offer or on which of these earmarks. Until that is clarified, there is no reason to move forward.

And, also, let me point out again unless you are in secret session, you can't discuss exactly what the earmark might be about; so you might run afoul of any statements that you have signed or any confidentiality agreements that we are under in terms of classified information. And when I actually went up with the list to look at the classified annex again and pointed at certain earmarks, I was told that we are not sure what that was about. That was requested by a Member who is not on the committee. We don't know. And until we can have that Member actually stand up and be able to say what that earmark is about, whether it goes to a private company, whether it goes to an agency, we just don't know.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAKE. Yes.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, let me again reassure the gentleman that every single earmark here followed the House rules. Every Member that has an earmark certified, like every Member is required to in the House, that they had no specific interest, that the spouse had no specific interest with the company or companies where the money was going.

Mr. FLAKE. I don't sit on the Intelligence Committee; so there may be

some disagreement there about whether the ranking member was informed or not, and I think that will probably come to light later.

But in this case, if we had followed the rules, we would have had the list before the Rules Committee shut down the amendment process because you need to be able to offer amendments on specific earmarks. And in this case, unless a Member can go up and view the classified annex and come away with an assurance or some kind of comfort level that the earmark under question is for the intended purpose or it should be in the intelligence bill, then we are at a loss when we come to vote. I think our constituents expect us to be informed, and when we can't even go up and view the classified annex and be informed, then there is a problem.

Mr. REYES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAKE. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. REYES. Once again, Mr. Speaker, let me reassure my good friend and colleague from Arizona that the report, along with all the listing of earmarks, was filed appropriately, timely with the Rules Committee. Where the glitch occurred was in the printing.

But be that as it may, I want to tell you again, reassure you, that we did not handle the process in the Intelligence Committee any different than any other committee in the House, and I would hope the gentleman would understand that.

Mr. FLAKE. My office has a timeline, actually, if anyone is interested, and when we requested the list of earmarks, when we finally got it, what we were told by which office, and I can tell you this is no way to run a process, particularly given the recent history of problems that we have had in this regard. And that is why I am concerned, and that is why I feel we can't do that in an open session like this. We have to go to secret session.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAKE. Yes, I will.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman have now an amendment prepared that he is ready to offer?

Perhaps it would be that we could ask unanimous consent that your amendment be allowed to go forward.

Mr. FLAKE. Reclaiming my time, I would not, given that I cannot discuss some of what I need to discuss in open session, given what has transpired. I don't think that we can. That is why we need a closed session.

I will offer the motion, and if you don't feel that we need to go into closed session, then you can vote against it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I will be asking for a "no" vote on the previous question so

that I can amend this rule to allow the House to consider an amendment offered by Representative HEATHER WILSON of New Mexico and provide the appropriate waivers for that amendment.

The Wilson amendment would modernize the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act to enhance the ability of our Nation to protect itself in times of war and elevated national security threats. And I think that point was made very,

very eloquently by the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Yesterday, the Rules Committee met and rejected on a party-line vote the Wilson amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I want to advise my friend from Florida that I just got a request for time here, and that is being discussed right now, that I was not aware of.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

#### **N O T I C E**

***Incomplete record of House proceedings.***

***Today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.***